THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA RECORD

NOVEMBER, 1920
NUMBER 182

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

FACULTY COMMITTEE ON EXTENSION

LOUIS R. WILSON
N. W. WALKER
M. C. S. NOBLE
D. D. CARROLL
L. A. WILLLIAMS
J. H. HANFORD
E. R. RANKIN
E. W. KNIGHT
W. W. PIERSON, JR.
E. C. BRANSON
P. H. DAGGETT
H. W. ODUM
P. J. WEAVER

CHAPEL HILL
1920

The Bureau of Extension of the University of North Carolina

The University of North Carolina through its Bureau of Extension offers to the people of the State:

I. General Information:
Concerning books, readings, essays, study outlines and subjects of general interest. Literature will be loaned from the Library upon the payment of transportation charges each way.

II. Instruction by Lectures:
Popular or technical lectures, series of lectures for clubs or study centers, and addresses for commencement or other special occasions will be furnished any community which will pay the traveling expenses of the lecturer.

III. Home Study Courses:
For teachers in educational subjects and for the general public in elementary, high school, and college branches.

IV. Guidance in Debate and Declamation:
Through the High School Debating Union, special bulletins and handbooks, and material loaned from the Library.

V. County Economic and Social Surveys:
For use by counties in their effort to improve their economic and social condition.

VI. Municipal Reference Aids:
For use in studying and drafting municipal legislation and assistance in municipal government.

VII. Educational Information and Assistance:
For teachers, principals, superintendents, school committees and boards.

VIII. Club Study Outlines:
For members of women's clubs or civic organizations pursuing special lines of study.

IX. Information Concerning County Home Conveniences:
For rural homes in North Carolina.

For full information, address

THE BUREAU OF EXTENSION,
Chapel Hill, N. C.

The High School Debating Union

History and Purpose

The High School Debating Union was organized among the secondary and high schools of North Carolina by the Dialectic and Philanthropic Literary Societies of the University during the school year 1912-1913. It was organized to encourage debating in a definite, systematic fashion among North Carolina high school students. The query of that year was, RESOLVED, *That the Constitution of North Carolina should be so amended as to allow women to vote under the same qualifications as men.* Ninety schools took part in this state-wide debate on February 22, 1913. Sixteen schools won both debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill for the Final Contest. The Pleasant Garden High School of Guilford County, represented by Messrs. Grady Bowman and S. C. Hodgin, on the affirmative side, was the winner in the Final Contest, on March 7, 1913, and accordingly was awarded the Aycock Memorial Cup.

A Part of Extension Work

During the school year of 1913-1914 the High School Debating Union moved onward with splendid success. It received the additional support of the Bureau of Extension of the University, in order to insure its permanence and enlarge its usefulness and scope. Everywhere, all over the State, it was recognized as a definite, big part of the University's effort to bring itself into a helpful relation with every community and every person in North Carolina. One hundred and fifty schools enrolled in the Union and took part in the triangular debates on March 20, 1914. Forty-one schools won both of their debates and sent their teams, numbering 164 debaters, to Chapel Hill to compete in the Final Contest. Before an audience of 2,000 in Memorial Hall, on April 3, 1914, the Winston-Salem High School, represented by Messrs. Charles Roddick and Clifton Eaton, on the negative side, won the Final Contest and was awarded the Aycock Memorial Cup. The query was, RESOLVED, *That the Constitution of North Carolina should be so amended as to allow the Initiative and Referendum in State-wide legislation.*

The Contest of 1914-1915

The contest of 1914-1915 was the most successful which had yet been held. Two hundred and fifty schools in 90 counties became members of the Union. Representing them, 1,000 student-debaters spoke, March

26, before large audiences in cities, towns, and rural communities all over North Carolina, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt the policy of subsidizing its Merchant Marine engaged in foreign trade.* Fifty schools won both debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill to compete in the Final Contest. Before another splendid audience in Memorial Hall, on April 9, 1915, the Wilson High School, represented by Misses Lalla Rookh Fleming and Ethel Gardner, on the negative side, won and was awarded the Aycock Memorial Cup.

The Contest of 1915-1916

Three hundred and twenty-five schools represented by 1,300 debaters enrolled in the Union during the fall of 1915 for a great State-wide debate March 31, 1916, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt the policy of greatly enlarging its Navy.* Sixty-eight schools won both debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill to compete in the Final Contest. The Aycock Memorial Cup was won, on April 14, 1916, by Miss Myrtle Cooper and Boyd Harden, on the affirmative side, of the Graham High School. Five hundred visitors came to Chapel Hill for the Final Contest of the Debating Union and the other features of High School Week.

The Contest of 1916-1917

The query which was discussed in the fifth annual contest of the High School Debating Union was, RESOLVED, *That the Federal Government should own and operate the railways.* The state-wide contest on March 31, 1917, was participated in by 1,324 student-debaters, representing 331 schools. Seventy-four schools won both debates and sent their representatives to Chapel Hill to compete in the Final Contest. Messrs. Vinson Smathers and Roy Francis, affirmative speakers of the Waynesville High School, were victorious from the total number of 296 debaters present, and were awarded the Aycock Memorial Cup, the final debate being held in Memorial Hall on April 20, 1917, before an audience which taxed to the utmost the hall's capacity. The number of visitors coming to the University for the exercises of High School Week was six hundred.

The Contest of 1917-1918

The sixth contest centered around the query: RESOLVED, *That Congress should enact a law providing for the compulsory arbitration of industrial disputes.* The finals were held at Chapel Hill on April 11, and 12, 1918, when 66 teams with 264 debaters participated. This was probably one of the most spirited and hotly contested debates ever held on the Hill. From first to last the good sportsmanship of every one was a matter of most favorable comment. Thomas Burton and Will

Anderson, representing the Wilson High School, on the negative side, won the decision and carried the Aycock Memorial Cup back to Wilson for the second time, Wilson having won the 1915 contest.

The Contest of 1918-1919

The query which was discussed in the seventh annual contest of the High School Debating Union was, Resolved, *That the United States Government should adopt a policy requiring one year of Military Training of all able-bodied men before they reach the age of 21.* One hundred and eighty schools in seventy-five counties took part in the state-wide discussion of this subject on April 4, 1919. Forty-one schools won both of their debates and sent their teams, numbering 164 debaters, to the University to participate in the final contest for the Aycock Memorial Cup. Miss Aura Holton and Leo Brady, representing the Durham High School, on the negative side, were successful in winning the award of the Aycock Memorial Cup, in the final debate held in Memorial Hall on May 2, 1919.

The Contest of 1919-1920

Two hundred high schools participated in the eighth annual contest of the High School Debating Union. The query was, Resolved, *That the United States should adopt a policy of further material restriction of immigration.* Forty-four high schools won both debates and sent their teams, numbering 176 debaters, to the University to participate in the final contest for the Aycock Memorial Cup. Arthur Kale and Clifton Ervin, of the Asheville High School, representing the affirmative side of the query, won the award of the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate held in Memorial Hall on April 23, 1920.

The Query for 1920-1921

The query which will be discussed this year by the schools having membership in the High School Debating Union is, Resolved, *That the policy of collective bargaining through trade unions should prevail in American industry.* A great deal of attention has been centered in this country by the general public in the relations between capital and labor. Two national conferences have been held at the call of President Wilson to consider the capital and labor problem. It is felt that the high school students of the State will study and discuss this subject with interest, and enthusiasm, and with profit to themselves and their communities.

Membership of the Union

Every secondary and high school in North Carolina is invited to become a member of the Union and participate in this State-wide debate. Every school that enters will, as usual, be grouped with two others in

a triangle, each school putting out two teams, one on the affirmative and the other on the negative. Every school which wins both of its debates will be entitled to send its teams to Chapel Hill to contest for the State Championship and the Aycock Memorial Cup.

Regulations

1. The Dialectic and Philanthropic Literary Societies of the University of North Carolina will suggest a query, to be discussed on a given date by the schools entering the Union.

2. All secondary schools of North Carolina, however supported, offering regularly organized courses of study above the seventh grade, and not extending in their scope and content beyond a standard four-year high school course as defined by the State Department of Education, shall be eligible for membership in the Debating Union.

3. All schools accepting this offer and thus becoming members of the Union shall be arranged into groups of three, for a triangular debate, the status and standards of the schools, their proximity, accessibility, and convenience of location to be considered in forming the groups.

4. Each school of each triangular group shall agree to furnish two debating teams of two members each, the one to uphold the affirmative side of the query, and the other to defend the negative side.

5. The members of the debating teams must all be bona fide students of the school which they represent. To be bona fide students, they must be in attendance at the time of the debate, and they must have been in attendance for at least 30 per cent of the school year up to and including the date of the debate, and must have made passing grades on a majority of their studies.

6. The team debating at home shall in each case uphold the affirmative side of the query, and the visiting team the negative.

7. The schools themselves shall select and agree upon the judges of the local contests.

8. Each speaker shall have twenty minutes at his disposal, not more than fifteen of which shall be used in the first speech.

9. Any school which shall win both of its debates shall be entitled to send both of its teams to the University for the State Championship Contest. Provided, that the committee may, with the approval of the schools, arrange for a second triangular contest between the winning schools throughout the State prior to the final contest at the University, should this plan appear to be a wise one. In this case, only those schools whose teams should win both debates in the second contest would be entitled to representation at Chapel Hill.

10. In the event that one school of a triangle drops out and the committee at Chapel Hill is unable to secure a school to take its place,

then the two teams remaining shall debate one another, each sending a team on the negative to the other.

11. In the event that two schools of a triangle drop out of the Union and the committee is unable to secure schools to take their places, then the remaining school shall be declared the winner over the others, by their default.

12. The school having the strongest team on the affirmative side of the query and the school having the strongest team on the negative side shall be entitled to contest publicly in Memorial Hall at the University for the Aycock Memorial Cup. (The strongest team on each side of the query is to be determined by means of preliminary contests in debate at Chapel Hill.)

13. The school which shall win the debate, thus finally held, shall have its name inscribed on the Memorial Cup, together with the names of its two winning representatives.

14. Any school which shall win in the final contest for two years in succession shall have the cup for its own property.

15. All high school representatives and principals coming to the University for this contest will be met at the station by a committee and will be entertained free of cost while at Chapel Hill.

16. All contestants are expected to prepare their own speeches with legitimate assistance of the teachers, principals, or superintendents in their school system. *Legitimate assistance* is interpreted to mean *oral* advice, suggestions, discussion, and criticism.

Suggestions as to Judges

1. The judges should be disinterested parties to the success of either team, and, so far as possible, should be non-local.

2. They should sit apart during the debate.

3. They should judge the contest *as a debate*, and at its conclusion without consultation should vote "Affirmative" or "Negative" on the merits of the *debate*. They should not consider the merits of the question.

4. Each judge should sign and seal his vote and deliver it, through an usher, to the presiding officer who should publicly open the votes and announce the decision.

5. Before the debate begins a copy of these suggestions should be given to each judge for his guidance.

Originality of Debates

The High School Conference in session at Chapel Hill during the summer of 1916 recommended, "That the principals of the schools in the various triangles be urged to take some steps among themselves looking toward the originality of the debates." The committee realizes

that "The debate which a speaker produces should be his very best; but it should under no circumstances be better than his best"; that the success of the Union will be seriously hindered unless in each instance the speech of a debater represents his own individual work. It wishes, therefore, to ask the principals to give this matter their careful consideration and to note particularly Regulation No. 16. In cases where necessary, the principals in the various triangles should take such action among themselves as they deem necessary.

Enter Your School Now

The High School Debating Union is essentially an organization for the secondary and high schools of the State. That it possesses unlimited possibilities for usefulness to every high school and teacher and to every community in the State goes without saying. Its success, however, and its benefits to those concerned are dependent upon the support accorded it by the students and school men of North Carolina. If your school has not yet enrolled, in order that its possibilities for usefulness to you may be realzied, see to it that your school—the school of which you are principal, or the school which you attend, or the school in your community—enrolls immediately in the Union.

For fuller information, address

E. R. RANKIN, *Secretary*,
HIGH SCHOOL DEBATING UNION,
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Collective Bargaining

Query

RESOLVED, *That the policy of collective bargaining through trade unions should prevail in American industry.*

Explanation and Limitation

For the purpose of uniformity and definiteness of issue in the debates of the High School Debating Union, the following explanation and limitation of the query is expressly laid down:

It is understood that this query affirms that, in these main lines of American industry, viz., mining, manufacturing, building, and transportation, it should be the policy of employers to recognize trade unions and to make collective bargains with their employes through accredited representatives of the trade unions.

Collective Bargaining

Brief

RESOLVED, *That the policy of collective bargaining through trade unions should prevail in American industry.*

Introduction

I. The capital and labor problem has always been a vital one in American history, and today no other question is so full of absorbing interest and concern for the general public.

II. Latest official figures credit the trade unions with a membership somewhat exceeding two million persons, which is 18.4 per cent of the potential trade union membership in America.

III. The main contention of the chief labor leaders today is that a policy of collective bargaining through trade unions should prevail in American industry. The question at issue is whether as a policy in four principal lines of our industry trade unions should b erecognized and dealth with by employers.

IV. A trade union is a voluntary association of working people in any particular trade, organized to further or maintain their rights, privileges, and interests with respect to wages, hours, and conditions of labor, efficiency, education, mutual insurance, customs, etc. Among typical examples of trade unions are the Textile Workers of America, the United Mine Workers of America, and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

AFFIRMATIVE

I. Collective bargaining is an absolute necessity for the wage-earner today.

A. The old system of individual relations between employer and employee no longer exists and in its stead wage earners must deal with huge corporations in whose grasp they are, single-handed, helpless.

B. As a matter of self-protection and survival, the wage-earner must stand together with his fellow workers.

C. It is equally as proper and advantageous for labor to associate

itself into organized groups for the advancement of its legitimate interests as it is for capital to combine for the same object.

D. As Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, says: "The workman who attempts to make a bargain with the directors of our highly developed industry places himself in the position of a helpless, rudderless craft on a tempestuous ocean."

II. Collective bargaining finds its best and only true expression through trade unions.

A. A trade union is a democratic institution formed by wage-earners themselves for the purpose of maintaining or improving their conditions of employment.

B. Efforts at collective bargaining through other agencies than trade unions have met with failure.

C. Company unions are not free and untrammeled but are governed by the wishes of the employing corporation.

D. Trade unions, born eighty years ago in England out of the very extremity of the laboring classes, have greatly liberalized human relations.

1. When the first trade union was organized it was unlawful for workmen to gather together even in small assemblies to discuss the conditions under which they labored.

III. The policy of collective bargaining through trade unions has justified itself in the benefits conferred upon employes and employers.

A. Trade unions have secured for the wage earners higher wages, shorter hours, and better working conditions.

B. Trade unionism has provided the employer with more efficient workmen and with industrial stability. Accidents have been diminished.

C. The conduct of the unions has been characterized by sobriety and conservatism.

D. Trade unionism has elevated the standard of citizenship of the American workman.

IV. Public interests demand that trade unions should be recognized and dealt with by employers.

A. Industrial peace, which is an essential to public safety and to the permanence of our institutions, cannot be had where wage-earners are denied consideration for their own organizations.

B. Trade unions have advanced the best interests of society by

fighting for and securing beneficial legislation relating to woman and child labor, hours of work, and the sweat shop.

C. Trade unionism has justified itself in its results and has been successful where it has been tried. It has increased the value set on man by his fellow men.

D. Labor recognizes instantly the organizations of capital, and capital should just as quickly recognize the organizations of labor.

V. Granted proper recognition, trade unionism will bring forward many new benefits to humanity not now evident.

A. Thus far trade unionism has been compelled to fight for its very life and has had no fair chance to show what it can do for the building of a finer civilization.

B. Trade unionism is in harmony with industrial democracy and with all the principles of freedom which have prevailed through America's history.

NEGATIVE

I. A general policy of collective bargaining through trade unions is unnecessary, unwise and impracticable.

A. Our great industrial development has been built up without adherence to such a policy as this.

B. Present relations in this country between employer and employee are in the main satisfactory.

C. This policy would destroy the principle of freedom of contract as between employer and employee.

D. As only 18 per cent of wage-earners are members of trade unions this policy would substitute minority rule for majority rule. It would be impracticable in any possible event.

II. Trade unionism has not proved by its results that it should be extended in American industry.

A. Strikes and acts of violence involving loss of life and untold damage to property have frequently occurred.

B. Labor unions break their agreements and they cannot be held to account, as they are not incorporated.

C. Trade unionism has resulted in destroying competition between good and poor workmen, in lessening production, and limiting the output of plants.

III. Collective bargaining should be carried on wherever it may be necessary between each employer and his own employes.

A. The interests of the individual employer and his employes are identical.

B. It is unfair to the employer to force him to deal with paid agitators who are not from among his own employes, as he

would be compelled to do in case the policy of the affirmative were adopted.

C. The second national industrial conference after mature study recommended the plant as the proper complete unit for collective bargaining.

IV. The closed shop, which is the natural goal of the affirmative's plan, is un-American in principle and unjust in practice.

A. Under the closed shop no one can work unless he has membership in a union and no man has an enforceable legal right to membership in a trade union.

B. A closed shop policy is monopolistic in the extreme and it makes of the trade unions stronger organizations than the government.

C. A closed shop policy means that the employer must surrender the privilege of employing his own workmen and it frequently means that he must discharge old and faithful employees.

V. Public interests demand that the open shop, and not the closed shop, should prevail in American industry.

A. The open shop is in accord with the ideals of the American democracy.

1. It guarantees to the workman his constitutional rights of personal liberty and freedom of contract. In the open shop, the workman makes his contract direct with the employer and is not compelled to abide by decisions of a trade union.

B. The open shop gives to every man an opportunity to work without his having to pay exorbitant union membership fees.

C. The general public should not entrust such great power as is found in the closed shop to labor. The public should ask that labor and capital arbitrate all vital questions on which they cannot agree.

General References

EXTENT OF TRADE UNIONISM

(By Leo Wolman, in the *Annals of the American Academy*, Volume 69, pages 118-127, January, 1917.)

I.

The problem of determining the extent of trade unionism in a country can be attacked first by registering the absolute membership of labor organizations and then by calculating the ratio of this membership to the industrial population of the country. The first step, because of the present disorganization in the collection of this form of labor statistics in the United States, necessitates laborious compilation from a large number of scattered sources. Beyond this, although some slight difference of opinion may exist as to the definition of a trade union and hence as to the statistical limits of the study, the problem is one of mere enumeration. With regard, however, to the calculation of the relative extent of trade unionism, the difficulties are many and real. If a trade union be defined as a voluntary organization of wage-earners, an accurate index of the numerical extent of the trade union movement would be the ratio of the total membership of trade unions to the wage-earning population. Unfortunately, no attempt is made in the census to distinguish a wage-earning class; and previous to the publication of the Census of Occupations of 1910, which contains a much more detailed analysis of the occupational distribution of the working population than can be found in any earlier census, not even a reliable estimate of the extent of a wage-earning class was feasible. With the material that is now available, however, it is possible, by making rough deductions of those groups included in the Census of Occupations of 1910 that are clearly comprised by members of the employing and salaried classes, to obtain a reasonably accurate basis for calculating the extent of trade unionism among the wage-earners of the United States.

The total membership of trade unions in the United States in 1910 was 2,116,317; in the same year the total number of persons gainfully engaged in industry in this country was 38,134,712. The members of trade unions, therefore, constituted in the last census year 5.5 per cent of the industrial population of the United States. This percentage, however, appreciably underestimates the strength of the trade union movement because of the inclusion, in the aggregate of persons "gainfully engaged" in industry, of members of the employing and salaried

classes. By combining those groups in industry that are composed of members of the employing, salaried and fee-receiving classes, such as merchants, managers and clergymen, a total for this group of 10,939,808 is obtained. Accordingly, the wage-earning class in 1910 can be said to have numbered 27,194,904 persons; and of this number 7.7 per cent were members of labor organizations. Adherents of the labor movement would maintain that this last index, based upon a group that includes such wage-earners as agricultural laborers, domestic servants, and clerks, was still not fairly indicative of the actual strength and extent of trade unionism. They would use as a basis for the calculation of the percentage of organization that group of wage-earners which the modern trade union makes definite and sustained efforts to organize. Since no such efforts have been made, until the present at least, to organize agricultural laborers and domestic servants, because of their condition of individual isolation, and because the social and economic status of such employees as clerks and stenographers precludes any large extension in organization among that class of workers, it is contended that a fair estimate of the extent of labor organization can be based only upon a group in which these classes are not included. Furthermore, practically every trade union has established an age limit below which it will not admit workmen in the industry into membership in the union. The average lower age limit for all trade unions may be roughly stated at twenty years. When all persons engaged in industry as agricultural laborers, in domestic and personal service, in such occupations as stenographers and saleswomen, and also persons below the age of twenty be combined and the total for this group be deducted from the 27,000,000 wage-earners in the United States in 1910, a resulting group of 11,490,944 persons, who may be characterized as constituting a potential trade union membership, is obtained. And with this class as a basis, the degree of organization is found to be 18.4 per cent. Accordingly, the most conservative survey of the situation would indicate that in the United States in 1910, 92.3 per cent of the wage-earners were unorganized; whereas, the most liberal estimates would show that 81.6 per cent of those persons who are susceptible of organization were without the trade union.

The foregoing statement must be qualified in one important respect. A large factor in the relative extent of trade unionism is the territorial distribution of the working force of the nation. The influence upon the growth of labor organizations of the urbanization and concentration of industry is well known to every student of industrial history. It is generally true that, where workmen live in thinly settled communities and work in small establishments, the rise and growth of trade unions

is long retarded. It is this condition that, to a great extent, explains the surprisingly low percentage of organization. Large numbers of carpenters and bricklayers, for example, are to be found in the rural sections of the country. Even though such workmen may constitute potential competitors of laborers in the urban districts, the union finds it not only difficult but also undesirable to organize them because of the expense of propaganda and of organization. If, therefore, it were possible to calculate the extent of organization among workmen living in cities of 10,000 population and over, the available data on the subject lead one to believe that the percentage would be much higher than for the country as a whole.

II.

The trade union movement is naturally made up of relatively strong and relatively weak component parts. In some industries the unions have attained an absolutely and relatively large membership, while in others the degree of organization is so small as to be almost negligible. It would be desirable, therefore, to classify the various industries according to the strength of the organization, with a view to throwing some light upon the causes of low and high percentages of organization. The absence of practically any organization among agricultural laborers, and among those employed in domestic and personal service and in clerical service has already been noted. The subsequent discussion will be limited to the mechanical and manufacturing, extractive, transportation and building industries. For the purposes of analysis the industries are classified into three groups. The first group is composed of the highly organized industries or those having an organization of over 30 per cent; the second group contains those industries that are fairly organized and in which the extent of organization lies between 15 and 30 per cent; the last group of poorly organized industries is comprised of those having an organization of less than 15 per cent. The following table presents the industries of the first group:

Name of industry	*Number of persons in industry*	*Percentage organized*
Breweries	55,413	88.8
Marble and stone yards	55,558	45.4
Printing and bookbinding	249,456	34.3
Glass factories	83,641	34.2
Mining	834,456	30.5
Total	1,278,524	

Of the five industries included in this table, three are organized along occupational lines and two industrially. In the marble and stone yards, printing and bookbinding industry, and glass factories the ratio

of the number of skilled to unskilled workingmen is comparatively high; and the high degree of organization in these industries is to be explained by the high percentage of organization among the skilled workmen. In mines and breweries, however, although the relative amount of unskilled labor is somewhat greater than in the first three cases, the adoption of the industrial form of organization, together with other factors has effected as high a degree of organization as where the ratio of skilled workmen is somewhat greater. The unusually high percentage in breweries is attributed to the effective use by the United Brewery Workmen of the boycott as an organizing device.

In the next table are given those industries that show an organization from 15 to 30 per cent:

Name of industry	*Number of persons in industry*	*Percentage organized*
Cigar and tobacco	170,904	27.3
Potteries	26,369	21.9
Transportation	2,862,260	17.3
Cothing	608,892	16.9
Building trades	2,444,395	16.2
Total	6,112,820	

The facts elicited in the discussion of the first table are for the most part confirmed by the evidence contained in the second. Defining an occupation in the broader sense as including closely related forms of labor, it is not improper to state that the unions claiming jurisdiction over the various operatives in each of the foregoing industries are all trade or occupational unions. Furthermore, the ratio of unskilled to skilled workmen is appreciably higher in this than in the first group of industries. Whatever organization does exist is to be found in the main among the skilled workers. This is notably the case in the building and transportation industries where such skilled workmen as locomotive engineers and bricklayers are highly organized whereas the unskilled maintenance of way employes and building laborers are totally unorganized. In the clothing industry there is still room for a considerable extension of organization even among the skilled or semi-skilled operatives; here, however, the policy of the union and the changing character of the labor force in the industry have constituted serious obstacles to increased organization. In the manufacture of cigars and tobacco, also, the problem has been not only one of organizing unskilled workers and of opening the union of the skilled to the unskilled, but the difficulty of organizing the latter has been greatly enhanced by effective opposition to unionism from the American Tobacco Company.

The last table is composed of those industries that have an organization of less than 15 per cent:

Name of industry	*Number of persons in industry*	*Percentage organized*
Leather	293,035	14.5
Electric light and power	252,883	14.3
Lumber and furniture	597,174	10.7
Iron and steel	1,746,387	9.9
Food and kindred products	299,176	7.6
Quarrying	85,919	7.3
Metal	320,041	4.7
Textile	800,251	3.7
Paper and pulp	101,797	2.6
Chemical and allied industries	73,585	0.4
Total	4,570,248	

The high correlation between skill and extent of organization is again the most striking feature of this table. Where trade unionism is most extensive, the great bulk of trade unionists are skilled workmen. The iron and steel industry, for example, shows an organization of 9.9 per cent; but practically all of the organization exists among such skilled workmen as iron molders and pattern makers. The unskilled laborers in the steel mills, over whom the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers claims jurisdiction, have an organization of probably less than 2 per cent. The same situation exists in the leather, lumber, textile, paper and chemical industries. Another, and perhaps a more important, element responsible for the lack of organization in several of these industries is the concentration of ownership which places in the hands of the managers of the industry various means for combating the growth of organization. The persistent opposition of the United States Steel Corporation, the International Paper Company, and of the American Woolen Company to trade unionism has been as potent a factor in hindering the organization of their employes as the presence in these industries of large numbers of unskilled laborers.

The American labor movement, however, is almost completely, in the strict sense of the term, a trade union movement. Only in recent years has there been any palpable extension in the direction of industrial organization. The extent to which the industries of the country are organized does not for this reason indicate with the greatest accuracy the success of labor organizations in organizing those workers over whom the individual organizations claim jurisdiction—that is, those workingmen who are employed in well-defined and in, for the most part, skilled trades. The foregoing analysis should accordingly be supplemented by a survey of the extent of organization in the more important occupational or trade divisions or industry. Unfortunately, the avail-

able material does not permit of an exhaustive treatment, but it is possible to obtain a sufficient number of occupations to warrant guarded generalization.

Excluding from the discussion those occupations in which there was no organization, of the thirty-three trades concerning which statistics were obtainable, five—railway conductors, electrotypers, brakemen, locomotive engineers, and stonecutters—were from 50 per cent to 100 per cent organized. In the next group of occupations, from 30 to 50 per cent organized, were brick masons, printers, potters, and wool-sorters. The third and largest group, comprised by trades from 15 to 30 per cent organized, included bakers, barbers, bartenders, book-binders, carpenters, coopers, loomfixers, metal polishers, painters, plumbers, switchmen, tinsmiths, and woodcarvers. And in the final class, with an organization of less than 15 per cent, were blacksmiths, brickmakers, glove workers, machinists, teamsters, and waiters.

In practically all occupations the percentage of organizations is higher than in the various industrial divisions; and this is the natural result of the occupational character of the typical American labor union. Where these organizations have expended the greatest efforts, they have met with the most signal success. Beyond this, however, differences in organization can as before be explained by the varying proportions in different industries and occupations of skilled and unskilled workmen.

A summary of the situation in 1910 would indicate that the small percentage of organization is due primarily to four factors: 1. The great bulk of the unorganized workers live in small towns and rural districts where their inaccessibility and dispersion make organization both difficult and, if not undesiable, at least not pressing. 2. Of almost equal importance as a problem of organization is the unskilled worker. By reason of the large supply of unskilled labor and the ease with which it may be replaced, organization of the unskilled has, up to the present at least, made little progress. 3. A somewhat greater success in organizing the unskilled laborers seems to have been attained by the use of the industrial form of organization than by the trade union. It should be noted, however, that, although the majority of American unions are nominally occupational organizations, many are rapidly assuming the character of industrial unions. 4. Finally, the concentration of ownership, combined with a hostility to labor organizations, has constituted in most cases an insurmountable barrier to the labor organizer.

III.

Trade unionism has in this country made little progress in organizing woman labor. The temporary character of the labor of women, their youth, and the fact that in the great majority of instances their wages

are designed to supplement the family income have all constituted serious obstacles to their organization. Accordingly, of the 8,075,000 women "gainfully engaged" in industry in the United States in 1910, 73,800 or only 0.9 per cent were members of labor organizations. And if deductions, similar to those made above, are made of those women engaged in employing and salaried positions, in agriculture, domestic and personal service, professional service, and as clerical workers, a residuum of 1,819,741 women, having an organization of only 4.1 per cent is obtained. In only one industry is there what might be considered a relatively high percentage of organization; of the 2,407 females employed in the liquor and beverage industries, from 20 to 30 per cent were members of the union. In the clothing industries, where the number of female workers is large, organization ranges from only 10 to 15 per cent. The same is true of the more important occupations in which there are large numbers of female employees. The highest percentage of organization in all occupations is among the bookbinders of whom less than 20 per cent are organized. It is probable that since 1910 the proportion of organized female labor has increased rapidly. In the period from 1910 to 1913, for instance, the female membership of American unions increased more rapidly than their total membership. One explanation for this disproportionate increase is, of course, to be ascribed to the small number of female unionists in the basic year of 1910. It is still true, however, that a significant factor in the trade union has for the first time secured a foothold among the female employees.

IV.

Of perhaps greater interest and importance than the ascertainment of the extent of labor organization in any one year would be the determination of the relative growth of organization over a long period of years. In the only exhaustive study of the growth of labor organization in this country, Professor Barnett finds that from 1897 to 1914 the membership of American trade unions increased from 444,500 to 2,674,400; the maximum membership in this period being 2,701,000 in 1913. By using the method of interpolation, he calculated the industrial population in the years 1897 and 1914. With these as a basis, the 445,000 trade union members in 1897 were seen to constitute 1.66 per cent of the numbers of gainfully occupied persons in that year; whereas, in 1914, the 2,674,400 trade unionists constituted 6.28 per cent of the gainfully occupied. In the period under discussion, therefore, the trade unions showed a substantial relative as well as an absolute increase in membership. The relation between the growth in membership and the growth in the number of wage-earners can unfortunately be calculated for only the census years. Here, too, Professor Barnett has roughly calculated the wage-earning population in the United States in 1900

and 1910; in the former year the trade union membership was four per cent of the number of wage-earners and in 1910 seven per cent of the wage-earners were members of labor organizations.

In the period from 1910 to 1913, it is likely that the increase in the membership of unions kept pace with the increase in the number of wage-earners. The industrial depression in 1914 caused a significant decrease in membership. Since 1914 there has probably been a large absolute and relative growth of trade unions, due primarily to the great expansion in industry in this country following the outbreak of the European War. It is well known that in times of industrial prosperity and of sharp demand for labor, the growth of labor organization is rapid; in times of depression, on the other hand, membership either remains stationary or suffers a slight fall. During the last year or more, not only has there been an enormous industrial expansion and a consequent scarcity of labor, but this scarcity has been greatly accentuated by the unprecedented decrease in the volume of immigration. The net effect of these forces should be, first, a large increase in the absolute membership of labor unions and second, a corresponding increase in its growth relative to the increase in the number of wage-earners. That there has been in the last year a remarkable growth in the membership of trade unions is evident from the facts contained in contemporary reports on trade unions; and that the second circumstance is being effected, it is not, in the light of present conditions, unreasonable to assume.

References—Affirmative

THE ECONOMIC NECESSITY OF TRADE-UNIONISM

(By JOHN MITCHELL, in the *Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 113, pages 161-170, February, 1914.)

Those who declare themselves to be in favor of trade-unionism in the abstract but opposed to it in the concrete, are not unlike the western farmer who announced that he was unreservedly in favor of the construction of railroads but unalterably opposed to the running of trains. Trade unions were formed for a definite purpose; they have well-defined policies and methods of procedure; they are great, democratic institutions administered by practical men who are earnestly and successfully striving for the amelioration of the conditions of the poor.

In its fundamental principle, trade-unionism is a recognition of the fact that under modern industrial conditions the individual, unorganized workman cannot bargain advantageously with the employer for the sale of his labor. Since the workingman has little or no money in reserve and must sell his labor immediately; since, moreover, he has no knowledge of the market and no skill in bargaining; since, finally, he has only his own labor to sell while the employer engages hundreds or even thousands of men and can easily do without the services of any one of them, the workingman, if bargaining on his own account and for himself alone, is at an enormous disadvantage. Trade-unionism recognizes the fact that under such conditions the workman becomes more and more helpless, because the labor which he sells, unlike other commodities, is a thing which is of his very life and soul and being.

In the individual contract between a powerful employer and a single workman the laborer secures the worst of the bargain. He is progressively debased because of wages insufficient to buy nourishing food, because of hours of labor too long to permit of sufficient rest, because of conditions of work destructive of moral, mental, and physical health; and, finally, because of danger from accident and disease, which kill off the workingman or prematurely age him. The individual bargain or individual contract between employers and workmen means that the condition of the economically weakest man in the industry is often that which the average man must accept. Therefore, there can be no permanent prosperity to the wage-earners, no real, lasting progress, no consecutive improvement in conditions until the principle is firmly and fully established that in industrial life, especially in enterprises on a large scale, the settlement of wages, hours of labor, and all essential conditions of work, shall be made between employers and workingmen collectively, and not between employers and workingmen individually.

It will thus be seen that the philosophy of trade-unionism is the very antithesis of individual bargaining or unrestricted competition among wage-earners.

The policy of collective bargaining as advocated by the unions recognizes and teaches the interdependence of labor and capital. It is the bridge that spans the gulf which modern industrialism has created between the workman and the employer. It is only necessary to attend a joint conference between the representatives of any of the great trade unions and the representatives of employers or employers' associations, when wage-agreements are under discussion, to be convinced that there are no more antagonisms engendered, and no more ill feeling displayed, than there are between any other groups of men meeting in conference for the purpose of buying and disposing of a commodity which one must have and the other must sell.

The organized workingman, as a rule, is not hostile to the employer of labor; he does not entertain any feelings of hatred against the man who has honorably acquired wealth. The workingman understands fully well that his wages must come from the earnings of industry, therefore he is interested in the successful conduct of industry. In common with many other good citizens he may fear that there is some danger to society, and to the institutions of our country, in the possession of enormous wealth by a few men, and he regards as immoral the acquirement of wealth through the payment of less than living wages and the imposition of unjust conditions of employment.

It is true that in their wage-conferences the employers and the organized workmen are not always able to agree, and that strikes or lockouts occur. It is equally true that strikes and lockouts occur in trades and industries in which the workers are not organized. Indeed, many of the most bitterly contested strikes of which we have any record have been inaugurated and conducted by non-union men. Fresh in the memories of all are the reports of the scenes attending strikes of non-unionists at McKees Rocks and Bethlehem, Pennsylvania; at Paterson, New Jersey, and at Lawrence, Massachusetts. If one desires to learn the truth in regard to the causes which make for class hatreds, let him mingle with the non-union workmen employed in some of our great industries. These workmen, denied by their employers the right of organization, compelled to work long hours for low wages, frequently hate their employers with an intensity which results in scenes of turmoil and disorder when strikes take place.

Trade-unions strive for peace based upon industrial righteousness. A strike, nevertheless, is of itself neither illegal nor immoral. On the contrary, a strike may be and often is a manifestation of a wholesome, yea, even a divine, discontent. Said Abraham Lincoln, in a speech delivered at Hartford, Connecticut, in 1860, "Thank God, we have a

system of labor where there can be a strike. Whatever the pressure, there is a point where the workingman may stop."

Our courts have declared repeatedly that workingmen have a legal right to organize in trade unions, that they have a legal right to strike for higher wages, for shorter hours, for better conditions of life and labor, indeed, for any reason that seems sufficient to them. It has been held by the courts that union workingmen have a legal right to refuse to work with non-union men. There has been no decision in any suit instituted under the Sherman Anti-Trust law which would justify the opinion that an organization of workingmen, even if it embrace every man employed at the trade, is an unlawful monopoly. It is true that the United States Supreme Court has decided, in the Danbury Hatters' case, that labor-unions are not exempt from the provisions of this law. It is also true that, in a suit for damages instituted under the provisions of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law, judgment was rendered against certain members of the Hatters' Union by a court in Connecticut. This case, however, is still in the courts, and even should the United States Supreme Court sustain the decision of the trial court, that action would not, by any process of reasoning, justify the contention that a labor union is a combination or conspiracy in restraint of trade. The issue involved in this particular case is not the right of men to organize in trade unions or to strike for higher wages. The allegation of the plaintiff, one Loewe, a hat manufacturer, was that through the instrumentality of a secondary boycott, he had suffered large losses, and the claim was that he was entitled to damages.

Perhaps the most serious charge brought against the voluntary associations of labor is that higher wages are responsible largely for the high prices which consumers are now required to pay for what they buy. Dr. Laughlin says: "There is no question whatever in my mind that the rise of prices of almost all articles of general consumption during the last decade or two has been due, as much as to any one thing else, to the rise in money wages paid for the same, or even less, labor effort." This is a strange and unusual contradiction of what is almost uniformly asserted by leading economists, nearly all of whom hold that the world-wide movement of increased prices is due primarily and principally to the increase in the quantity of money which has followed the extraordinary production of gold during the past sixteen years. No doubt the increase in the cost of food-products in the United States is additionally accounted for by the fact of the growth of city population. It is not denied that increased wages may and often do add to the cost of production, but that the world-wide movement of increased prices and higher cost of living is chargeable in any considerable degree to higher wages and "less labor effort" is unthinkable and unbelievable.

But even if it were true that the higher wages secured for labor through the instrumentality of the trade unions are responsible for the increase in the cost of living, that fact would not justify their condemnation, nor would it sustain the claim that from an economic standpoint the increased wages secured during the past two decades have not benefited the recipients of these increased wages because there has been a corresponding increase in the cost of living. If workingmen are not benefited by increased wages because there is a corresponding increase in the cost of living, then it must follow as a matter of course that workingmen would suffer no injury, that there would be no lowering of their standard of living, if wages were reduced. The fallacy of this reasoning is that it fails to take into account the fact that to increase wages does not always increase the cost of production, since, among other reasons the workingman becomes more efficient when he is better paid, better fed, better clothed, and better housed.

In many industries, prices have little to do with wages, but are arbitrarily fixed at a monopoly figure and remain the same whether wages are high or low. For illustration, steel rails are quoted at the same price per ton now as when the employees of the steel companies received ten per cent less wages; newspapers and magazines are cheaper now than they were when employees in the printing trades received much lower wages than they do today. In the matter of the number of persons employed, railroading is the greatest industry in the United States. Practically all men engaged in the transportation service, and a majority of those engaged in the shops of railroads, are members of trade unions. The wages of all railway employees have advanced substantially and repeatedly during the past twenty years, yet during this period the charge to shippers for hauling freight has been reduced 17.5 per cent per ton per mile. Passenger rates are 6.3 per cent less now than they were twenty years ago. Therefore, while the cost of transportation is a vitally important element in fixing the value of every commodity purchased or used by the people, yet this cost has not been increased—on the contrary it has been reduced—notwithstanding the fact that during the past twenty years the average wages of railway employees have advanced 28.77 per cent.

Moreover, even if we agree that higher wages have increased the cost of production, the fact still remains that the increase in the cost of the articles produced is never in proportion to the rise of wages. The cost of many of the materials, ground-rent, the interest on capital, taxes, royalties, the cost of supervision, are not necessarily affected by an increase in wages to the workmen. Again, if the employer receives, as he often does, exorbitant profits, it would not necessarily increase the cost to the consumer if a part of those exorbitant profits were paid in wages to the workmen. Furthermore, workingmen do not consume all

the articles they produce, and an increase in the wages of men making grand pianos, or of weavers of fine carpets, or of fifty-seven other varieties of articles used exclusively by the rich or the well-to-do, does not in any way affect the purchasing power of the money in the ordinary workingman's envelope.

In his attempt to demonstrate that an advance in money wages is of no value to the workman and to prove that increased wages paid to labor are responsible for the increase in the cost of products, Professor Laughlin says, "In the expense of producing raw materials such as coal, ore, wool, and the like, into whose processes labor enters more largely than machinery, the general rise of wages raises out of all proportion the prices of materials from which finished goods are made." An analysis of this statement will prove interesting and illuminating. In the raising of wool and in the production of ore, except copper and gold, union labor is not employed. There is no union of workingmen engaged in the production of wool, and very few union men are employed in the manufacture of woolen goods; the organization of metalliferous miners is confined largely to the production of copper and gold therefore wool and ore may be eliminated from consideration. In the production of coal, however, union men are engaged. In fact, in the mines of practically every important coal-producing state, with the exception of West Virginia, Alabama, and Colorado, union labor is employed almost exclusively. This has not always been so. Prior to 1897 unrestricted competition of labor—that is, non-unionism—prevailed in the coal-producing industry. In 1896, when there was little or no organization among the coal-miners, the average market price of bituminous coal loaded on the railway cars at the mines was 83 cents per ton; the average price paid to miners for producing a ton of screened coal was 45 cents. Sixteen years later—that is, in 1912—at a time when the miners had become strongly organized, the average market prices of bituminous coal loaded on the railway cars at the mines was $1.15 per ton; the average price paid to miners for producing a ton of screened coal was $1.00. The significance of these figures is that while wages paid to miners for mining a ton of coal during the period from 1896 to 1912 have advanced 122 per cent, the price received by the mine-owners has advanced only 38.5 per cent. Therefore, it cannot be true that even in an industry in which wages are the principal element of cost in production, an advance in wages "raises out of all proportion the prices of materials from which finished goods are made."

Moreover, the material benefits which have come to the miners as a result of trade union effort are not all represented by the increased wages received for mining a ton of coal. In the year 1896 the average production of the bituminous coal miners of the United States was 2.94 tons per man per working day; in the year 1912 the average production

of the bituminous coal-miners of the United States was 3.68 tons per man per working day. In 1896 ten hours was the length of the work-day, whereas in 1912 the eight-hour day prevailed. It will thus be seen that the income of the bituminous coal-miners has increased much more than is represented by the advance in the schedule of rates for mining coal.

But what is more important, these increased wages and shorter hours of labor have wrought a tremendous change in the intellectual and moral as well as in the physical lives of the mine-workers. They are no longer, as they once were, a poverty-stricken, hopeless, despairing people They are men; men whose outlook upon life is that of hope, of cheer, of intelligent, constructive discontent. And the experience of the miners is typical of that of all workmen. Low wages, long hours, evil conditions of employment—the inevitable results of unrestricted competition of labor—mean the degradation of the workers, the abandonment of hope, a deadening of the finer senses, the survival of the strongest, the destruction of the laboring classes.

Unrestricted competition of labor—that is, non-unionism—finds its natural and inevitable sequence in the sweat-shop and the slum; it finds its logical expression at Lawrence, at Paterson, at McKees Rocks, at Bethlehem, and in the mining fields of West Virginia. Unrestricted competition of labor is portrayed by Millet, and depicted by Markman in "The Man With the Hoe."

The suggestion, heard in more than one quarter, that trade unionism is in conflict with the law and the state, or that trade unionists wage war on society, has no foundation in fact. Trade unionism stands for the constructive development of society, it seeks the more equitable distribution of wealth in order that all our people may develop to the extent of their highest and best possibilities. In contradiction to the dire apprehensions sometimes expressed by critics and opponents of trade unionism, listen to the words of the great English statesman, William E. Gladstone: "Trade unions are the bulwarks of modern democracies"; to those of Wendell Phillips: "I rejoice at every effort workingmen make to organize. I hail the labor movement, it is my only hope for democracy. Organize and stand together; let the nation hear a united demand from the laboring voice!" Again, hear Thorold Rogers, during his life Professor of Political Economy at the University of Oxford: "I look to the trade unions as the principal means for benefitting the working classes"; and Mr. Taft, when President of the United States: "Time was when everybody who employed labor was opposed to the labor union; when it was regarded as a menace. That time, I am glad to say, has largely passed away, and the man today who objects to the organization of labor should be relegated to the last century."

Notwithstanding the splendid work and the great achievements of the organized wage-earners in protecting those in our social and industrial life who are least able to protect themselves, efforts are constantly being made to discredit and destroy the trade unions. Open foes and professing friends alike have sought their undoing, the former by siege or assault, the latter by insidious attempts to divert them from the course they have pursued so successfully. And yet every year the unions grow in strength, in numbers, and in influence; they grow in the affections of the wage-earners; they grow in the respect of fair-minded employers; they grow in the esteem of right-thinking men and women everywhere.

The critics of trade union policy have suggested that the employer "introduce into his shops carefully worked-out plans for helping the operatives to rise in life, to better conditions by welfare work, to encourage savings and thrift, to introduce the stimulus of profit-sharing." I have no desire or disposition to detract from the value of welfare work; on the contrary, I wish to commend every employer who undertakes at his own expense to improve and make more pleasant and wholesome the conditions under which his employees work. Welfare work, however, is not a substitute for wages. If the employer desires to supplement the wages agreed to between himself and the union, such action is not inimical to trade unionism and may be of great value to all concerned; but the workingmen will not be lured by any device from their allegiance to trade unionism, they will not accept welfare work or profit-sharing in lieu of just wages and the right to organize; they will not and should not depend upon Lords Bountiful and Ladies Charitable; they prefer to depend upon themselves and their trade unions as the means through which to work out their economic salvation.

THE REASON FOR THE UNIONS

(By WASHINGTON GLADDEN, in the *Outlook*, Volume 97, pages 497-502, March 4, 1911.)

The trade union has always had insurance features and social and educational features, and these are the features which the average employer is ready to indorse; but the main purpose for which they are organized is thus succinctly expressed by Mr. and Mrs. Webb: "To provide a continuous association of wage-earners, for the purpose of maintaining or improving the conditions of their employment." This purpose the average employer does not approve of; when the union begins to exert its power in regulating wages or hours or conditions of labor, he thinks that it is getting out of its sphere and becoming a menace to the social well-being.

Here, now in the crux of the situation. This is the main function of the trade union—to organize to express the will of its members in bargaining about terms and conditions of labor. For one who disputes this right to say that he believes in trade unions is much like saying that he believes in watches provided they have no mainsprings, or in rivers so long as there is no water in them. No one can intelligently say that he approves of trade unions unless he approves of giving to the men who are organized in them the right of dealing, through their representatives, on equal terms with their employers, concerning the wages they shall receive, the hours they shall labor, and the conditions under which their work shall be done.

There are employers who appear to say that they are willing to permit trade unions to negotiate about these matters, provided the unions will pledge themselves beforehand not to enforce their demands by striking. It does not appear, however, that these employers propose to divest themselves of the power to reduce wages, against the will of the men, or to dismiss whom they will without the consent of the union. They expect to keep for themselves all the power they now posses; all they ask is that before entering upon the struggle for the division of the joint product of capital and labor the representatives of labor shall tie their own hands behind their backs. The proposition does not appear to be a very chivalrous one; probably while human nature remains as it is, and the competitive regime continues to prevail, it will not be widely accepted.

What, then, shall we say about this demand of the unions—that they shall have the right, collectively, through their chosen representatives, to bargain with their employers about wages and conditions of labor? Is it a reasonable demand? I think that it is eminently reasonable and just, that no fair-minded employer ought for one moment to question it.

Let us remind ourselves that we are not dealing now with the old domestic system of industry, in which there were nearly as many men as masters, and the cases were rare in which the capitalist employer did not personally know all the people in his employ. Most of our industrial maxims are drawn out of that old regime, and have no application to the present order. Let us remember that we are dealing now with the large system of industry, in which a single responsible employer represents hundreds or thousands of stockholders, and deals with hundreds or thousands of employees—a relation in which personal friendships and sympathies between employer and employee have come to be a negligible quantity. Suppose, now, that there is no organization among the laborers, or none that has any power to deal with questions of wages or hours of labor. The competitive regime is founded on the assumption that prices will be fixed by "the higgling of the market." How much "higgling of the market" is likely to take place between a

single laborer and such a corporation? Let Sidney and Beatrice Webb set forth the details of the process. The case supposed is that of a labor market in perfect equilibrium.

"We assume that there is only a single situation vacant, and only one candidate for it. When the workman applies for the post to the employer's foreman, the two parties differ considerably in strategic strength. There is first the difference of alternative. If the foreman, and the capitalist employer for whom he acts, fail to come to terms with the workman, they may be put to some inconvenience in arranging the work of the establishment. They may have to persuade the other workmen to work harder or to work overtime; they may even be compelled to leave a machine vacant, and thus run the risk of some delay in the completion of an order. Even if the workman remains obdurate, the worst that the capitalist suffers is a fractional decrease of the year's profit. Meanwhile he and his foreman, with their wives and families, find their housekeeping quite unaffected; they go on eating and drinking, working and enjoying themselves whether the bargain with the individual workman has been made or not. Very different is the case with the wage-earner. If he refuses the foreman's terms even for a day, he irrevocably loses his whole day's subsistence. If he has absolutely no other resources than his labor, hunger brings him to his knees the very next morning. Even if he has a little hoard, of a couple of rooms full of furniture, he and his family can only exist by the immediate sacrifice of their cherished provision against calamity, or the stripping of their home. Sooner or later he must come to terms, on pain of starvation or the workhouse." It is now universally agreed, Professor Marshall tells us, "that manual laborers as a class are at a disadvantage in bargaining." The fact is so palpable that it is needless to quote authorities. A single laborer has no fighting chance in dealing with a great corporation; he can only accept what is offered him. The consequence is his inevitable degradation. Professor Marshall points out that "the effects of the laborer's disadvantage in bargaining are cumulative in two ways. It lowers his wages, and, as we have seen, this lowers his efficiency as a worker, and thereby lowers the normal value of his labor; and, in addition, it lowers his efficiency as a bargainer, and thus increases the chance that he will sell his labor for less than its normal value."

Under the present system of large industry, with competition as the regulative principle, unorganized labor is always driven on the downward road. This results not only from the inequality between the single laborer and the great corporation, but also from the competition between employers. For the employer of humane and liberal sentiment, who wishes to pay his working people the highest wages possible, finds himself unable to compete with the unscrupulous employer, who,

by forcing wages down, is able to produce goods cheaper than the former can, and thus to undersell him in the market and get his business away from him. Mr. John Graham Brooks quotes a retired shoe manufacturer of wealth who said of the trade union: "They make a good many stupid mistakes, but an organization strong enough to fight the employer is a necessity to labor. Competition so forces many of the best employers to copy the sharp tricks of the worst employers in lowering wages, that the trade union must be equipped to fight against these reductions or for a rise in wages when business is more prosperous."

The fact that unorganized labor is steadily forced downward toward starvation and misery is a fact which no student of industrial conditions would dream of denying. The history of the industrial revolution by which the factory system supplanted the domestic system of production is full of examples of this process. Men who angrily declare that there shall be no organization of labor ought to read carefully the industrial history of the second quarter of the nineteenth century, when the conditions which they consider ideal were prevailing in the great industrial centers. There were no unions in England during the earlier part of this period: laws of the most drastic character, which made it a criminal conspiracy for two or three workingmen to consult together for the purpose of securing shorter hours or better wages, had effectually stamped out unionism.

For the employers it was a most prosperous period; wealth was increasing by leaps and bounds, great fortunes were being heaped up; but the chasm between the employer and the employed was steadily widening, and the condition of the working people was becoming more and more deplorable. "In the new cities," says Arnold Toynbee, "the old warm attachments, born of local contiguity and intercourse, vanished in the fierce contest for wealth among thousands who had never seen each other's faces before. Between the individual workman and the capitalist who employed hundreds of 'hands' a wide gulf opened; the workman ceased to be the cherished dependent; he became the living tool of whom the employer knew less than he did of his steam-engine."

Government reports of this period show that children of five and six years of age were frequently employed in factories. Men and women stood at their daily tasks from twelve to fourteen and fifteen hours; a working day of sixteen hours was not an unheard-of thing. Even at that early day the demand was loud for machines that could be tended by women and children; and their husbands and fathers were driven out of the shops and compelled to stand idle in the market-place. "Nor was this unmeasured abuse of child labor," says Mr. Hyndman, "confined to the cotton, silk, or wool industries. It spread in every direction. The profit was so great that nothing could stop its

development. The report of 1842 is crammed with statements as to the fearful overwork of girls and boys in iron and coal mines, which doubtless had been going on from the end of the eighteenth century. Children, being small and handy, were particularly convenient for small veins of coal, and for pits where no great amount of capital was embarked; they could get about where horses and mules could not. Little girls were forced to carry heavy buckets of coal up high ladders, and little girls and boys, instead of animals, dragged the coal-bunkers. Women were constantly employed underground at the filthiest tasks."

Through all this period wages gravitated downward, and while the cost of food increased the family income was steadily lowered. The Parliamentary reports give us pictures of the life of the people in all the great manufacturing centers that leave nothing for the imagination: "In the parishes of St. John and St. Margaret there lived in 1840, according to the 'Journal of the Statistical Society,' 5,366 workingmen's families in 5,294 'dwellings' (if they deserve the name), men, women and children thrown together without distinction of age or sex, 26,830 persons all told; and of these families three-fourths possessed but one room. In the aristocratic parish of St. George, Hanover Square, there lived, according to the same authority, 1,465 workingmen's families, nearly six thousand persons, under similar conditions, and here, too, more than two-thirds of the whole number crowded together at the rate of one family in one room."

What other possible barrier can be interposed between the working class and these forces of selfishness that always tend to exploit and degrade them? Shall the power of the State be called in to protect them? The state may usefully interfere in behalf of children and women, and in the interest of public health, and for the safeguarding of the life of the laborer, and in some other ways; but so long as competition is the regulative principle of industry the state can do very little to shield the laboring man from the pressure on his means of subsistence of the superincumbent mass of consolidated capital. Nor is it desirable that the state should take any class of its citizens under its special patronage.

There is no question that, in the well-weighed words of John Mitchell, "trade unionism has justified its existence by good works and high purposes. . . . It has elevated the standard of living of the American workman and conferred upon him higher wages and more leisure. It has increased efficiency, diminished accidents, averted disease, kept the children at school, raised the moral tone of the factories." Much of the legislation by which the conditions of the laboring classes have been improved is due to the initiative of the unions. Beyond all controversy, that frightful deterioration of the industrial classes which the large system of industry set in deadly operation has been arrested,

and the lot of the laboring man has been vastly improved during the last seventy-five years. No such horrible living conditions as those which I have described above can be found today in the great factory towns of Great Britain; even "the submerged tenth" are living far more decently now than the average mechanic was living then. Even Pittsburg, in all its misery, is a paradise compared with Manchester and Glasgow in the third and fourth decades of the ninetenth century. Many causes have wrought together to produce this improvement, but the students of social science agree in their judgment that the most efficient cause of that improvement has been the organization of labor. It has enabled the working people to resist the pressure that would have degraded them, and to demand and secure a fairer share of the wealth which their labor produces.

It is true that not all workingmen have been included in the unions, but even those outside the organizations have largely shared in the gains that have been won by organized labor. When, in an open shop, the union succeeds in getting better wages or shorter hours, the non-union men get the benefits of the rise. The unorganized trades, like that of the sewing women, have, no doubt, often been exploited by their employers; but the general level of wages is undoubtedly kept up by the labor unions.

So great have been the benefits which unionism has brought to the laboring classes and to the community at large that a philosophic statesman like Professor Thorold Rogers, of Oxford, declared that if he had the making of the laws he would exclude from the franchise all workingmen who were not members of trade unions. Certain it is that the man who proposes to outlaw or exterminate them assumes a heavy responsibility.

UNIONISM VS. ANTI-UNIONISM

(Editorial in the *New Republic*, Volume 8, pages 178-180, September 23, 1916.)

The majority of contemporary controversies between wage-earners and their employers involve directly or indirectly one issue of overwhelming importance. They involve the issue of labor organization itself, of the extent to which it deserves to be encouraged or discouraged and of its function in the industrial system of a democratic nation. No other questions connected with the industrial situation provoke such harsh and stubborn differences of opinion. Many well meaning people who may favor some legislative program of "social justice" are opposed to or suspicious of unionism—that it, to the attempt of the wage-earners to secure justice for themselves. The lack of any effective consensus of opinion about the merits and dangers of unionism has passed comparatively unnoticed hitherto, because it has not brought

with it any immediately inconvenient consequences. The "public" had assumed an attitude of neutrality, based on ignorance and irresponsibility, and knew no sufficient reason for reaching a decision on such a perplexing controversy. But recently the resulting immunity from serious inconvenience has ceased. Strikes are becoming the order of the day. They interfere with service of supplies necessary to the public comfort; they compromise vital public interests; they are calling for increasing intervention by the government. Yet if the government is to intervene intelligently and effectively; it must act upon some consistent policy with respect to the merits and the function of labor organization, which has the support of public opinion. What is that policy to be?

It is a formidable question, which demands a many-sided and carefully balanced answer, but one phase of this answer can, in our opinion be made short, sharp and decisive. It should be the policy of unionism, to recognize its merits, to define its functions, and to make it an essential part of the national industrial system. As long as the unions are required, as is so frequently the case at present, to fight not for an improvement in the economic conditions of their members, but for their very lives, no progressive social adjustment of the conflict between the wage-earners and their employers is possible. The conflict is degraded to a level in which fear and suspicion are the dominant emotions and some kind of violence the inevitable, if reprehensible, weapon.

A very rudimentary analysis of the sources of unionism will indicate the danger to the national integrity of allowing the issue of unionism itself to be raised. Wage-earners form unions because their individual ability to bargain with their employers is feeble and cannot be strengthened except by their acting together. If the individual wage-earner is dissatisfied with the conditions under which he is working he is inacapable of making an effective protest; but if all the wage-earners in a shop or a trade are capable of acting together they can often compel their employers to grant them better terms. Unionism is consequently an indispensable condition of the economic independence of the wage-earners as a class. It is as important to them as the vote is to the citizen or as some protection against the abuse of political authority is to the property-owner. By no other method can they safeguard themselves from being victimized by economic forces which may, indeed, occasionally operate beneficially to them, but which always operate irrespective of their inclinations and wills. The law has declared that labor is not a commodity, but despite the law it must remain a commodity unless wage-earners possess the power to participate effectively in the negotiations whereby their work is bought and sold. The thrifty wage-earner, acting as an individual, can, of course, change

his employment and sometimes better his condition, but acting as an individual his only choice lies between opportunities of employment over whose terms he himself can exercise no control. When employers refuse to negotiate with the unions, they are denying to their employees the very substance of citizenship in an economic community. They are trying to condemn their wage-earning fellow countrymen who as a class cannot be paid salaries or become property-owners, to the humiliation of having little or nothing to say about the major business of a wage-earner's life.

Hence the bitterness and intensity of the industrial conflicts which involve the question of union recognition. It is one of those ultimate issues which both sides refuse to arbitrate. The unionists compare arbitration about the recognition of their unions to the arbitration by a nation whether it is entitled to exist. The employers are equally reluctant either to recognize the unions until they are forced to do so, or to arbitrate the question of recognition, because they do not want to abandon any share of their economic power to independent and, from their point of view irresponsible organizations. As soon, consequently, as this issue is raised, smething like civil war sets in, and both parties have a tendency to fall back upon violent methods. The employers spend large sums in collecting social derelicts from all over the country with whom to keep their business going and to break the power of the unions. These unfortunates are assaulted by the unionists and in the absence of an efficient police force have to be protected by gunmen. The laws, the institutions and the authority of the state are perverted by both sides, each in its own interest. The social atmosphere is poisoned by recriminations, fear, and hatred, and the beaten party retires sullenly to obscurity, fully determined to renew the conflict at the first favorable opportunity.

The fight for and against union recognition is embittered and irreconcilable, because it necessarily degenerates into an unscrupulous and desperate struggle to win or to keep power. The unionists are fighting for the possession of sufficient economic strength to enable them to become self-respecting citizens in an industrial democracy. The employers know that when the unions get the power it is frequently used in ways inimical to industrial efficiency, and they make this knowledge the excuse for refusing, wherever possible, to part with any share of their autocratic control. Officially the American nation has tried to evade the issue by admitting a "right" on the part of wage-earners to organize and an equally valid "right" on the part of employers to refuse to recognize organization. But when rights conflict and are asserted by large classes possessed of a considerable ability to enforce them, the national unity is compromised. Neither can it be restored by pious exhortations in favor of mutual good feeling and

peace. The war between unionism and anti-unionism is one about which neutrality is ceasing to be honorable or decent. If the American nation continues to be neutral, it will merely become the victim of both of the belligerents. Mr. Quackenbush, the chief of the legal department of the New York Interborough Company, has given emphatic expression to this opinion. During a recent public hearing, as quoted by the New York Tribune, he declared that the country could no more exist half-union and half-non-union than it could exist half-slave and half-free. We agree with him. The political party which first stands upon this truth, as the Republican party first stood upon the truth about slavery, will during the next generation enjoy, like the Republican party, a stormy but triumphant and fruitful career.

It it has come, as Mr. Quackenbush declares, to an exclusive choice between unionism and non-unionism, can any intelligent democrat doubt on which side the preference must fall? Should the American nation consent to the destruction of unionism, it would officially abet a policy of degrading the labor of its own citizens to the status of a commodity. Such an action would be just as suicidal as would have been the elevation of negro slavery, as the South wished, from a legal right into an aggressive national policy. The United States would present the extraordinary spectacle of the denial by the largest political democracy in the world of the essentials of industrial self-government to the class of wage-earners. The idea is preposterous, but is it any more preposterous than the present neutrality, between unionism and anti-unionism, than the sinister connivance at the frequent attempts made by large employers to eradicate unionism among their own employees? In so far as these attempts exist and succeed they create the same condition within a limited area as the adoption of a policy of discouraging unionism by the national government would over the whole country. They introduce irreconcilable antagonisms into the industrial system which are intermittently effervescing into violence and must inevitably continue to do so. Precisely because the warfare between unionism and anti-unionism in our industrial system compromises the public safety, and because anti-unionism is an impossible national policy, the nation must come to the deliberate and official discouragement of anti-unionism and the promotion of unionism.

Those employers who fear that the adoption of such a course would surrender them tied hand and foot, to a grasping labor oligarchy should ponder one salutary consideration. Up to date the unions have been struggling for the opportunity to survive and grow, and their policy has been determined by their position as semi-outlaws. They had to seek power in order to protect themselves from being exterminated; and when they seized it, with the threat hanging over them of being deprived of it, they could hardly be expected to exercise it con-

siderately. But after they obtain the security of recognition their attitude will change. A frank and loyal attempt to incorporate unions into the national industrial system will in itself tend to socialize the policy of the unions and make them more responsible. Unionism will then become one of the most powerfully and helpfully educative influences in the community. It will train a class of citizens whose political activities must remain for the present circumscribed in the purposive use of economic power. Industrial controversies will persist, but they will turn, not on the possession or the denial of power, but on the conflicting or varying purposes on behalf of which the two belligerents each propose to use their share of it. And the nation will not be indifferent to the outcome. The state will intervene partly to prevent the power of either party from being abused, but chiefly to discover and devise methods of adjustment between their conflicting purposes. Permanent boards of investigation will be needed, which will scrutinize specific labor problems, and processes and after a survey of all the available facts suggest tentative methods of overcoming immediate difficulties. Industrial controversies will thus become capable of something resembling a rational treatment. The labor costs and rewards which prevail in important industries will be audited by industrial experts just as the cost of managing a particular plant and of manufacturing and selling its products is now audited by expert accountants. The scientific management which is converting business into a profession would have its counterpart in a scientific analysis of labor problems and the gradual acquisition of a scientific method of dealing with them. In no other way can they be taken out of the dubious region of class conflict.

INDUSTRIAL PEACE

(By John Golden, in the *Annals of the American Academy,* Volume 44, pages 141-144, November, 1912.)

Industrial peace cannot even be hoped for where collective bargaining is denied to the organized wage-workers, or where vast numbers of unorganized workers prevail in any industry. The last ten years have witnessed what might be termed a racial revolution in the composition of help in many great industries. This is perhaps as much in evidence in the textile industry as in any other of our large industries. Forty years ago the employees were largely composed of operatives who had emigrated from Great Britain: English, Irish, Scotch and Welsh, with a dash of native-born Americans, made up the help in the cotton and woolen mills, silk mills being very rare at that period. After a while came the French Canadian, lured by the promise of a steady weekly wage. This class of operative was of a somewhat migratory kind, many

of them remaining only long enough to accumulate enough money to purchase a farm in their native country. As time went on they began to assimilate our American ideas and customs, until today there is little or no difference between the manners and mode of living of English-speaking and French Canadian textile workers.

The English-speaking mill workers brought with them, among their many British traits, that of trade unionism fostered and practiced by their forefathers in spite of the bitter opposition and at times cruel persecution of the old-time mill master who looked upon a trade union as a criminal attempt to destroy his business, and treated it accordingly. As the French Canadians became more Americanized, a tendency which quickly evidenced itself as the first crop of children began to attain manhood and womanhood, they also joined in with the English-speaking wage-workers and became active in the trade union movement. Then came the struggle for more sanitary conditions under which to work and live, and for higher wages; strikes and lockouts followed, but steady progress was being made irrespective of how these strikes or lockouts ended for the time being. Hours of labor were reduced, factory inspection was established and wages raised whenever and wherever the opportunity presented itself. As the textile industry grew, more operatives were needed, and while some improvements had certainly taken place which made the labor in the mills rather lighter than of yore, there was still little inducement for parents to put their children in the mills, and many a sacrifice was made, and many an anxious thought given to making it possible for John to be kept out of the spinning-room and Mary kept from the life of a weaver. Then started the movement that brought a stream of men, women, and children from Continental Europe. Southern Europe was scoured, and today our textile mills are peopled by thousands upon thousands of men, women and children who never saw a textile mill before coming to this country, who cannot speak a word of our language, who, in the beginning, were only too willing to work for whatever wages they could get, and were contented to live under almost any kind of conditions. They knew nothing of organization; trade unions were something beyond their power of understanding; hence the work started and carried along by the pioneers of the textile industry, that of raising the whole standard of this particular industry, was halted. And with the exploitation of the foreign-speaking operatives which became quite common on account of their lack of understanding of our American customs, in some instances the ground gained through the many struggles of the English-speaking operatives was almost entirely lost, and conditions became worse than ever.

What does all this mean? Where is it all to end? What is going to be its effect on the industrial peace of the future? While I have used

the textile industry as one illustration, everything that I have said in regard to this particular industry applies to many other of our large industries. The doors of immigration thrown wide open to the desirable and the undesirable, dumped down by thousands in one given spot, herded together sometimes under the most miserable and un-American conditions, used only for what energy they have left, not a thought given towards educating them even in the slightest degree into some understanding of our American institutions and our American ideals, an easy prey for the teachings of the anarchist and the demagogue, their minds and their brains fed and fired by an unlimited supply of literature that only attempted to appeal to their passions and to their class consciousness; these hundreds of thousands of wage-workers are today slowly but surely awakening to a realization of their power of numbers. That they have been exploited goes without saying. Their exploitation has also helped to crush down others who, speaking our tongue, loyal to our American flag and our American institutions, must forsooth go down for the time being in the great industrial struggle. The revolt of the iron and steel workers at McKees Rocks, the strike of the miners of West Virginia, the great uprising of the textile workers in Lawrence, all with their accompaniment of lawlessness and bloodshed, are symptomatic of the conditions of the times. Passions have been fired by the tongues of men who would tear down "Old Glory" tomorrow and flaunt the red flag of revolution from the same flagpole. We have yet heard only the rumblings of what may follow unless something be quickly and effectually done to secure for the wage-worker, whether he be born under our flag or any other flag, what he is entitled to: a fair return for labor performed, and a guarantee against exploitation by those who have induced him to come to our shores.

The trade union movement has done much to bring this about. That it has not done more is because every step it has taken and every effort it has made to elevate the standard of the wage-worker in any of our industries has been hampered, opposed and antagonized by those representing the capitalistic end; and on many occasions aided and helped considerably by a certain portion of our body politic, men and women of peculiar thought, who, while ostensibly aiming to wipe out capitalism, breed distrust, suspicion and discord among the ranks of the wage-workers to an extent that prevents real organization that wrongs may be righted and the wage-worker come into his own.

The lying tongue of the revolutionist and the demagogue is never silent in its work of poisoning the mind of the foreigner when he reaches our shores against the men and women in the labor movement, whose whole lives have been and are being spent in the work of uplifting the conditions of the toilers. There can be only one of two possible endings to this great industrial unrest and revolt: we shall either have

organization of wage-workers under safe, sane and law-abiding leadership, which believes in the abolition of all forms of involuntary servitude, in the principle of collective bargaining, mediation and arbitration; or we shall have organization that preaches class hatred and direct action, and practices sabotage and syndicalism.

The trade union movement stands today where it has always stood, and where it will stand in the future, for the uplift of the man who toils; for shorter hours of labor, that more time may be given for rest, recreation and education; for the abolition of child labor, that we may have a more vigorous manhood and a more healthy motherhood; for a wage that will guarantee a life worth living and enough to spare for old age; for obedience to our laws with the legal and moral right to protest when such laws become oppressive or curtail our God-given right of free speech and free press; for the right to organize and for the right to strike when all honorable effort has failed of a peaceful settlement. When these principles are fully recognized by all the people, and when all employers get away from the idea of being the embodiment of "divine right," and recognize the right of an employee either singly or collectively to have a say as to what conditions he shall labor under and for what wages he shall work; when, in a word, the Brotherhood of Man and the Fatherhood of God are fully and freely recognized by all, then, and not until then, may we even dream of Industrial Peace.

THE CLOSED SHOP

(*Bliss Encyclopedia of Social Reform.*)

"The philosophy of the closed shop is based upon the belief that the welfare of the laboring classes is bound up with the device of collective bargaining, that the success of the expedient depends upon its universal application, and that no individual workman can be conceded rights that are inconsistent with the welfare of his class."

Advantages of Trade Unionism. Without attempting a thorough discussion of this subject, we present the following summary of the advantages of the trade unions as cited in recent discussions of the closed shop:

The labor movement implies an orderly effort, not only to wrest concessions from the employer, but also to secure recognition from society. It is a movement which seeks to change the present standards by which the laborer's share in production is decided, and disputes the right of the employer alone to determine what fair treatment should be. It aims at industrial democracy and is in harmony with the world-wide tendency of the times.

The great consideration is to permit workmen to have a voice in the shop—to have control over the conditions of employment.

The trade unions have achieved the gradual and steady increase of wages and the shortening of the working-day.

Trade unions are coming to be recognized by employers as a permanent part of the industrial offer. In many trades in Great Britain the employers prefer to make terms with the trade-unions which shall apply to non-union workmen as well, rather than to make terms with each class separately. It is coming to be recognized as good policy to deal with the same form of organization and more and more to make that organization responsible, so far as may be, for meeting the obligations that are assumed by it for the workers in the trade it represents.

A well-organized union enables an employer easily to obtain efficient workmen; to make collective contracts, which are more satisfactory, cover a longer term, and more readily fulfilled than individual contracts; and it tends toward conservatism, and thus lessens the liability of strikes.

To seek to destroy unions because of their defects would be like attempting to abolish government because of its abuses. The unions with all their faults represent a forward stride of the human race. They cultivate a spirit of self-reliance and mutual assistance which ought to more than compensate for their faults.

As the unions become stronger and gain in experience, they tend to conservatism. The hard and stern conditions confronting them can be relied upon to keep them within bounds.

Union and Non-Union Employees. The reasons why union men refuse to work in the same shop with non-union men, and which are at the root of the contention for the closed shop, may be summarized as follows:

A shop with union and non-union men is like a house divided against itself. There is a constant attempt to organize it entirely; and incessant struggle to disorganize it completely.

While accepting the union scale of wages when work is plentiful, the non-unionist will immediately lower wages as soon as work becomes more difficult to obtain.

It is easy to speak of the open shop in which the employer does not care whether his men are union men or not. But the union cannot accomplish its most important object unless the employer deals with it as a union. The employer cannot be made to enter into a collective bargain—and without the collective bargain the conditions of labor are hardly fixed by bargaining at all—unless the union comprises practically all the men he wishes to employ.

Non-Union Workers. Much attention is given in the arguments of trade unionists to the character of the men who do not join the unions,

with the view of showing that much sympathy is misplaced when bestowed upon these workers, who as alleged, are deprived of their liberty to contract for employment.

Some refuse to join because of intolerable conditions existing in a union. It is maintained, however, that when such conditions exist, the abuses should be prevented by action within rather than without or against the organization.

Another reason given for not joining unions is because of strong but mistaken ideals of persons who believe in individual action, in the right of every man to do as he will, no matter how it may affect his neighbor. This policy, it is maintained, is not practicable in a civilized community.

Another class of non-union workers, it is maintained, consists of persons who, purely through selfish motives, seek to share all the advantages secured by the sacrifices of the trade unionists without bearing any of the burdens or incurring any of the risks.

Lastly, there is said to be a class of professional strike-breakers. These, it is claimed, are either dishonorably discharged unionists or they belong to the class of criminals, idlers, and incompetents who are only willing to work or to make a pretense of working in order to defeat the ends of honest working men.

The Legal Right. It is contended by trade unionists that in their action for securing the closed shop they are doing nothing but what is lawful.

As free citizens the wage-earners have the right to work or to refuse to work, to make certain demands for their welfare, and to strike if the demands are not granted. An employee has the right to say that he will sell his labor on condition that he is not to work with obnoxious persons. In like manner, laborers can combine to sell their labor collectively and on the same terms. They do not deny the right of employment to non-unionists, but simply refuse to work with them.

The union workmen who refuse to work with non-unionists do not say in so many words that the employer shall not engage non-union workers. The dictum of the trade union is not equivalent to an act of Congress or of a state legislature prohibiting employers from engaging non-union men. What the unionists in such cases do is merely to stipulate as a condition that they shall not be obliged to work with men who, as non-unionists, are obnoxious, just as they shall not be obliged to work in a dangerous or unsanitary factory, for unduly long hours, or at insufficient wages.

The Moral Right. The trade unionists claim that they are not only legally but also morally justified in refusing to work with non-union men.

Society makes right that which will accomplish the most good for its members as a body.

If it is wrong to ostracize or to refuse to associate with craftsmen who are indifferent to their common welfare, then it is equally wrong for professional men to shun others of their calling accused of unprofessional conduct, and it is wrong for merchants to taboo other tradesmen who disregard the ethics of their business.

In modern industry working men do not act as individuals contracting with employers. The workingman of today belongs to a group, and, whether he will or not, acts with his group and is treated like others of his group. He works the time worked by the others, receives the wages paid the others of his class, and obeys the regulations made for his group. His employer does not know that he exists, but simply knows that so many hundreds or so many thousands of men of his type are employed at a given wage, for a given number of hours, and under certain given conditions. What affects one of his class affects all.

Just as the individual owes a duty to society so also, though in a less degree, he owes a duty to his class. The non-unionist has no moral right to seek his own temporary advantage at the expense of the permanent interests of all working men.

If the union has a right to exist, which is no longer denied, it has a right to insist on those conditions which are necessary to its existence; and it cannot exist if non-union men are permitted to take the jobs of union men.

VIEWS ON TRADE UNIONS

(By Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor.)

I.

Today we find it just as necessary to defend the faith that is within us that the trade union is the natural and legitimate organization of the working classes as at any time since their first organization. Nor need this cause surprise. As a rule the trade unions have no platform of principles declaratory of purposes to which the flights of the imagination often soar, but which so frequently but simply, appeal to the passionate, the nervous, or the sentimental. The trade unions are the business organizations of the wage-earners, to attend to the business of the wage-earners; and while the earnest, honest, thinking trade unionists must necessarily be sentimental, theoretical, self-sacrificing, and brave, these if needs be they must sink for a time in order that the best interests of the wage-earners may be advanced. Even if but to gain a milestone on the thorny road of emancipation.

The trade unions have the serious work of labor's difficulties to deal with. They must contend for the toiler's rights and against the toiler's wrongs of today; to take up the gauntlet when it is thrown down to us; to throw it down in earnest battle to save the lives of our young and innocent children; to rescue them from the factories and work-shops where their bones and sinews are freely coined into dollars of the soundest kind; to place them in the play-ground and school-room, to make the labor of man so remunerative that it will enable the bread-winner to maintain his loved ones as becomes a man and citizen; to wrest from the profit mongers of all kinds the greatest monopoly on earth, the monopoly of the worker's time; to secure for the toilers, relief from the long hours of burdensome toil, and find work for those who cannot find work at all, to fight for full enfranchisement of labor, not only at the polls, in the halls of legislation, but far more important than all these, in the factory, work-shop, mill, mine, or field.

These are some of the questions that the trade unions have daily confronting them; winning battles and securing concessions here and there, sometimes a struggle lost, yet ever keeping up the contest until victory is fully and finally achieved. No wonder that the trade unions have little time and care less for declarations of principles, which though high-sounding phrases mean little, fade away and leave the workers demoralized and desperate, with hopes deferred and destroyed, indeed, too often with their hearts sad.

At best the struggles of labor, the obstacles in the path of progress of the working-class are severe enough, without their being continually called upon not only to defend the knowledge of and the faith in our organizations against the antagonism of pelf, avarice, and greed, but also to defend them against covert attack from pretended friends of our organizations and our movement. No wonder that the trade unions with these ever recurring struggles and contentions ever commanding their attention are more concerned in deeds than words, achievements than promises, practical results than theories.

II.

A man can, upon the prairie, build himself a hut and apply the torch to it. Let him attempt to do that in any one of our metropolitan cities and he will be arrested and put into jail, for out upon the plain he does himself the only injury that is being done; in the city he endangers the life, and the property, and the peace and tranquillity of his neighbors. If in the old, old time a man wanted to sell his labor to another, under the old and primitive conditions; if he desired to accept poor economic conditions as the result of his work, he injured no one but himself. In our day of highly developed industry, with concentrated wealth under the direction of the few—or comparatively few—the

individual workman who attempts to make a bargain with the directors or the representatives of such a directorate simply places himself in the position of a helpless, rudderless craft on a tempestuous ocean. If he but did himself a wrong, we might pity him and concede not only his legal but his moral right; but for the workman who toils for wages, and expects to end his days in the wage-earning class, as conditions seem to point, it will be a necessity—his bounden duty to himself, his family, to his fellow-men, and to those who are to come after him—to join in the union with his fellow-craftsmen and fellow-workmen to uphold the standard of life and to make joint effort for the uplifting of the wage-workers, and with them the whole social fabric of our time and for the time to come.

III.

That so long as man shall live and have his being, so long as there shall dwell in the human heart a desire for something better and nobler, so long as there is in the human mind the germ of the belief in human justice and human liberty, so long as there is in the whole makeup of man a desire to be a brother to his fellow-man, so long will there be the labor movement.

It expresses all of the struggles of the past, all the sacrifices and bitterness that the human family has tasted in its experience. The movement embraces all the tenderness of the human family, all of its hopes and all of its aspirations for the real liberty of mankind.

The labor movement is founded on the bedrock of opposition to wrong. It is based on the aspiration for right. I want you, and all of us, to coöperate with the best that is within us to make the labor movement strong and powerful and influential, and that it may grow day by day. And the day that comes shall see for it a better and brighter path than the day that has gone, and open up a new vista of light and life and happiness for the home and fireside and the wife and the children. And that the burdens of labor shall be lighter and man shall be a brother to his fellow-man.

IV.

The ground-work principle of America's labor movement has been to recognize that first things must come first. The primary essential in our mission has been the protection of the wage-workers, now; to increase his wages; to cut hours off the long workday, which was killing him; to improve the safety and the sanitary conditions of the workshop; to free him from the tyrannies, petty or otherwise, which served to make his existence a slavery. These, in the nature of things, I repeat, were and are the primary objects of trade unionism.

VIEWS OF JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER, JR.

(In an address before the Denver Chamber of Commerce, October 8, 1915.)

There has been so much said with regard to the views which my father and I have held and do hold in regard to the organization of labor, and also in regard to the relations which should exist between the various parties in any company or corporation, that it is perhaps not unfitting for me to state in a few words just what those views are. The position I took when called before the Subcommittee of Mines and Mining of the House of Representatives in Washington two years ago, in regard to the right of every American workingman to work for whom he pleased and upon such terms as he pleased, has been frequently misunderstood and misrepresented. It has been construed as indicating that my father and I were not only opposed to the organization of labor, but that we were persistently and continually fighting it. No such inference is correct, for absolutely the contrary is the fact. I can, perhaps, present in the briefest and clearest way the views which we hold on these two subjects by referring to several paragraphs from a statement which I read before the Industrial Relations Commission in New York last January:

"First, with reference to my attitude toward labor unions: I believe it to be just as proper and advantageous for labor to associate itself into organized groups for the advancement of its legitimate interests, as for capital to combine for the same object. Such associations of labor manifest themselves in promoting collective bargaining, in an effort to secure better working and living conditions, in providing machinery whereby grievances may easily and without prejudice to the individual be taken up with the management. Sometimes they provide benefit features, sometimes they seek to increase wages; but whatever their specific purpose, so long as it is to promote the well-being of the employees, having always due regard for the just interests of the employer and the public, leaving every worker free to associate himself with such groups or to work independently, as he may choose—I favor them most heartily. Combinations of capital are sometimes conducted in an unworthy manner, contrary to law and in disregard of the interest both of labor and the public. Such combinations cannot be too strongly condemned nor too vigorously dealt with. Although combinations of this kind are the exception, such publicity is generally given to their unsocial acts that all combinations of capital, however rightly managed or broadly beneficent, are thereby brought under suspicion. Likewise, it sometimes happens that combinations of labor are conducted without just regard for the rights of the employer or the public, and methods and practices adopted which, because unworthy or unlawful, are de-

serving of public censure. Such organizations of labor bring discredit and suspicion upon other organizations which are legitimate and useful, just as is the case with improper combinations of capital, and they should be similarly dealt with. I should be the last, however, to allow the occasional failure in the working of the principle of the organization of labor to prejudice me against the principle itself, for in that principle I strongly believe. In the further development of the organization of labor and of large business, the public interest, as well as the interest of labor and capital alike, will, it seems to me, be best advanced by whatever stimulates every man to do the best work of which he is capable; by a fuller recognition of the common interest of employers and employed; and by an earnest effort to dispel distrust and hatred and to promote good-will.

"I believe that the ultimate object of all activities in a republic should be the development of the manhood of its citizens; that such manhood can be developed to the fullest degree only under conditions of freedom for the individual, and that industrial enterprises can and should be conducted in accordance with these principles. I believe that a prime consideration in the carrying on of industry should be the well-being of the men and women engaged in it, and that the soundest industrial policy is that which has constantly in mind the welfare of the employees as well as the making of profits, and which, when the necessity arises, subordinates profits to welfare.

"A business to be successful must not only provide to labor remunerative employment under proper working conditions, but it must also render useful service to the community and earn a fair return on the money invested. The adoption of any policy toward labor, however favorable it may seem, which results in the bankruptcy of the corporation and the discontinuance of its works, is as injurious to labor which is thrown out of employment, as it is to the public which loses the services of the enterprise, and to the stockholders whose capital is impaired.

"I believe it to be the duty of every citizen to do all within his power to improve the conditions under which men work and live. I believe that that man renders the greatest social service who so coöperates in the organization of industry as to afford to the largest number of men the greatest opportunity for self-development, and the enjoyment by every man of those benefits which his own work adds to the wealth of civilization.

"In order to live, the wage-earner must sell his labor from day to day. Unless he can do this, the earnings from that day's labor are gone forever. Capital can defer its returns temporarily in the expectation of

future profits, but labor cannot. If, therefore, fair wages and reasonable living conditions cannot otherwise be provided, dividends must be deferred or the industry abandoned. I believe that a corporation should be deemed to consist of its stockholders, directors, officers and employees; that the real interests of all are one, and that neither labor nor capital can permanently prosper unless the just rights of both are conserved."

References—Negative

PRESENT INDUSTRIAL ISSUES

(By Judge Elbert H. Gary, in the *Reviwe of Reviews*, Volume 60,pages 487-490, November, 1919.)

The attention of the members of the American Iron and Steel Institute has of late been focused on the attempt of leaders in the American Federation of Labor to unionize the iron and steel industry of this country.

The present campaign was started at St. Paul, Minn., June 13, 1918, by the adoption of a resolution introduced by delegate W. Z. Foster, couched in the following language:

"Whereas, The organization of the vast armies of wage-earners employed in the steel industries is vitally necessary to the further spread of industrial democracy in America; and

"Whereas, Organized labor can accomplish this great task only by putting forth a tremendous effort; therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the executive officers of the American Federation of Labor stand instructed to call a conference, during this convention, of delegates of all international unions whose interests are involved in the steel industries, and of all the state federations and city central bodies in the steel districts, for the purpose of uniting all these organizations into one mighty drive to organize the steel plants of America."

The movement appears to have proceeded, under the general direction of Foster, without much result until June 13, 1919, when another resolution was adopted by the American Federation of Labor at a meeting held in Atlantic City, which reads as follows:

"Whereas, Every labor union in America, regardless of its trade or industry, has a direct and positive interest in the organization of the workers in the iron and steel industry, because the accomplishment of this vital task will greatly weaken the opposition of employers everywhere, to the extension of trade unionism and the establishment of decent conditions of work and wages; and

"Whereas, The organizing force now in the field working upon this vast project is altogether inadequate in strength to carry on the work in the vigorous manner imperatively demanded by the situation; therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That President Gompers of the American Federation of Labor, and Chairman of the National Committee for Organizing Iron and Steel Workers, be authorized to call a conference, during the convention of the American Federation of Labor of the heads of all in-

ternational unions affiliated with the A. F. of L., to the end that they make arrangements to lend their assistance to the organization of the iron and steel industry."

President Gompers thereupon named the heads of twenty-four affiliated organizations to act as a committee to develop and carry out plans for unionizing the iron and steel industry pursuant to the resolutions mentioned. You are familiar with what has occurred since that time, and you are more or less acquainted with the history of the different union leaders who have been connected with the attempt to enlist the employees and to bring about a strike in the manufacturing works. The strike, which has been directed by the union labor leaders and was begun, so far as I am informed, without any request or authorization from the workmen themselves, has been conducted in the usual way.

Immediately preceding the day fixed for ordering out the men, intimidating letters, large numbers of them being anonymous, were sent to the families of the workmen threatening physical injury to the father or husband, damage to or destruction of the home and kidnapping of the children unless the employee referred to should obey the order to strike. A number of the workmen, who had joined the unions voluntarily, accepted the order to strike and others remained away from the factories through fear.

In many if not most of the mills, the larger number of employees continued to work without interruption. At the beginning, many of the workmen who attempted to continue their work and others who had remained at home through fear and attempted to return, were confronted in the public streets and elsewhere by strikers, or pickets, and importuned to engage in the strike; and many were assaulted and seriously injured. After protection was afforded by the police, sheriffs' deputies, state constabulary, and in some cases state or national troops, the numbers resuming work increased appreciably from day to day until in many places operations are about normal. Taken as a whole, the situation at present is good and steadily improving.

The Sole Issue—Closed Shop or Open Shop

It will be observed that the strike is not the result of any claim by any workmen for higher wages or better treatment, nor for any reason except the desire and effort on the part of union labor leaders to unionize the iron and steel industry. As stated in the first resolution, the action taken was "for the purpose of uniting all these organizations into one mighty drive to organize the steel plants of America."

Without discussing for the present the merit or demerit of labor unions, it may be observed that union labor leaders openly state that they seek to unionize or, as they say, "organize" the whole industry of

this country. Those who do not contract or deal with unions, although they do not combat them, insist upon absolute freedom to both employer and employee in regard to employment and the management of the shops. The non-union employers and employees both stand for the open shop. The unions argue for the closed shop or, as the leaders now insist, "the right of collective bargaining through labor-union leaders."

Every proposition contended for by the labor unions at the national industrial conference at Washington led to domination of the shops and of the men by the union labor leaders. Every position taken by the other side centered on the open shop. This is the great question confronting the American people and, in fact, the world public. From 80 per cent to 90 per cent or more of labor in this country is non-union. It is for them and the employers generally, and the large class of men and women who are not, strictly speaking, employers or wage earners, to determine whether or not it is best for the whole community to have industry totally organized.

Judging by experience, we believe it is for the best interest of employer and employee and the general public to have a business conducted on the basis of what we term the "open shop," thus permitting any man to engage in any line of employment, or any employer to secure the services of any workman on terms agreed upon between the two, whether the workman is or is not connected with a labor union. The verdict of the people at large will finally decide this question, and the decision will be right.

Why the Industrial Conference Failed

I think the fundamental question submitted to the conference for recommendation to industries was the open shop; that question apparently could not be decided by majority vote for the reason that the conference was organized into three groups called labor, employers, and public. No affirmative action under the constitution or adopted rules could be taken except by the unanimous vote of the three groups, each of which voted by a majority of all its members. It was necessary to have such a condition, as otherwise there could be no conference in which there would be an agreement between capital and labor, so-called.

Collective Bargaining

The union labor advocates stand for collective bargaining through the unions. The others favor collective bargaining through representatives selected by the employees themselves from their own numbers.

The employers' group offered the following resolution:

"*Resolved,* That, without in any way limiting the right of a wage-earner to refrain from joining any association or to deal directly with his employer as he chooses, the right of wage earners in private

as distinguished from government employment to organize in trade and labor unions, in shop industrial councils, or other lawful form of association, to bargain collectively, to be represented by representatives of their own choosing in negotiations and adjustments with employers in respect to wages, hours of labor, and other conditions of employment, is recognized; and the right of the employer to deal or not to deal with men or groups of men who are not his employees and chosen by and from among them is recognized; and no denial is intended of the right of an employer and his workers voluntarily to agree upon the form of their representative relations."

The employers' group voted in favor of this resolution. The public group and the union labor group voted against it.

The public group offered the following resolution:

"The right of wage earners in trade and labor unions to bargain collectively, to be represented by representatives of their own choosing in negotiations and adjustments with employers in respect to wages, hours of labor, and relations and conditions of employment is recognized.

"This must not be understood as limiting the right of any wage-earner to refrain from joining any organization or to deal directly with his employer if he so chooses."

The public group voted in favor of this resolution. The employers' group and the union labor group voted against it.

The union labor group finally offered the following resolution:

"The right of wage earners to organize without discrimination, to bargain collectively, to be represented by representatives of their own choosing in negotiations and adjustments with employers in respect to wages, hours of labor, and relations and conditions of employment is recognized."

The union labor group and the public group voted in favor of the resolution. The employers' group voted against it. Thereupon the union labor group retired from the conference.

All through the conference whenever the question of collective bargaining was discussed, it was apparent that the union labor leaders would not support any resolution in favor of collective bargaining except on the basis that collective bargaining meant bargaining through labor unions.

As further evidence of the attitude of the union labor leaders it may be mentioned that in the twelve points published by the leaders who were conducting the strike they included and insisted upon the following:

"Abolition of Company Unions."

The unions claim that collective bargaining through different forms of shop organization, made up of the employes, tends to limit the

extension of unions by increasing their numbers. The non-union employees and their employers insist that collective bargaining through labor unions means that employees are forced to join the unions, as otherwise they could not be represented. So it is perfectly clear that the whole argument returns to the main proposition of open or closed shop.

In the conference there was no objection offered by any one to some form of collective bargaining as between employees and employers, provided both were free from outside representation and direction.

The labor group, so called, was made up of union labor leaders, leaving unorganized labor without special representation. The same mistake seems to have been made by a large portion of the public which was made throughout the war, namely, that organized labor really represents the workmen or wage-earners generally, notwithstanding, as a matter of fact, that at least 85 per cent of the total are non-union—not members of any union organization.

The employers' group, in which were men first-class in every respect, included men connected with large and important lines of industry, and also included several others, some of whom at least should have been with the labor group. In selecting the public group there were overlooked thousands of vocations, professions, artisan and other lines of industry, all of whom are more or less affected by the cost of production, the expense of living and, therefore, the control and conditions of both labor and capital.

Improvement of Working Conditions

However, it would seem there were many objects which might appropriately have been considered by the conference, and conclusions for recommendations arrived at by unanimous consent, which would be advantageous to the public good, and therefore to all mankind—such as working hours, living and working conditions, women's work, child labor, recreation, medical and surgical treatment, pensions, relief in times of stress, rates of compensation, schools, churches, and other educational facilities. With the right disposition and intelligence, the public group, as sole survivor of the conference, might have agreed upon recommendations to the industrial world which should be of substantial benefit. All of us are in favor of these principles, and of any others that may be suggested which we believe will be of real benefit to the wage-earners and to the general public.

I conceive it to be proper in this family of industrial workers consisting of 2,000 members of the most important basic industry, to claim that we have demonstrated in practice that we are upon a plane which is higher and better than ever before occupied by this industry in this country; that we have been striving to deserve the approval of

all who are interested in our business and our decisions; that we have sought the confidence of our employees; our customers, our competitors, our principals who own the properties we manage, and the general public.

And yet it would be unfortunate if we could not discover opportunities for further improvement; if we failed to read or to listen to the criticisms of others; if we let pass the requests or suggestions of our workmen for changes which they believe would be proper concerning their employment; if we neglected to give our employees—individually or in groups—opportunities to discuss with the managers all questions of mutual interest; if we minimize in any degree the well-recognized fact that the public good is of prime importance and that private interests must be subordinated. It is a pleasure to me to know from long experience that I am appealing to a sympathetic audience in behalf of a continued effort, on our part, to be more worthy of the respect and confidence of every right-thinking person who is familiar with our industrial life.

Considerable has been said in public of late concerning the attempt to spread the doctrine of bolshevism in this country. All of us have known for some time that this disease is persistent, and that there has been some inoculation even in this best of countries. Still, we deny that there is danger of serious trouble. There is only one way to treat this disease, and that is to stamp it out; to meet it boldly wherever it can be found; to expose it and give it no chance for development.

In this free country, with its reasonable laws wisely administered, its golden harvests, healthful climate, peace-loving inhabitants who are generous in contributions for relief and protection, schools, churches and hospitals, there is no room except in the prisons for the anarchist, the bolshevist, or the other individual who seeks to substitute the rule of force for the rule of law and reason. If there are slinking, desperate, murderous bolsheviki in this country, even in small numbers, I believe the secret service department of the government should detect and expose them, and that the iron hand of justice should punish them as they deserve. And, as I have faith in this country and in its institutions, I believe this will be done and done promptly.

Any one who doubts the ability of the proper authorities to protect the persons and property of our people against bolshevism and other similar doctrines, fails to appreciate the courage of our citizens, and the terrible force and strength of subdued calmness when they are surrounded by threatened danger.

For ourselves, let us be fair and just, considerate and determined, hopeful and complacent. We shall emerge from the waves of unrest which naturally follow the demoralization and terrors of war, and as a people we will be better and stronger than ever.

THE CLOSED SHOP

(By WALTER GORDON MERRITT, in the *North American Review,* Volume 195, pages 66-74, January, 1912.)

The "closed shop" is a system prevailing in factories conducted under a fixed rule that none but union men in good standing shall be employed at the trade involved. It is called the "closed shop" because its doors are barred against all employees whom the union does not recognize, and it is contrasted with the "open shop," where both union and non-union men are employed, without discrimination against either. The non-union man may be denied union membership; he may have been suspended or expelled, or he may not desire membership, but in either of these three contingencies the fact, and not the reason, that he is non-union is the conclusive disqualification against employment in a closed shop. As the employer cannot review the union's adjudication that a man is non-union, and as in most unions, like all secret societies, an applicant for membership must be approved or voted in and no court or any other authority can review the organization's action in rejecting the applicant, the result is that no man can secure employment in a closed shop except by consent of the union.

The first thought that strikes one is the prevalence of the demand for the closed shop, the almost universal hatred by the unions of the employer and employee who do not conform to it, and the remarkable ingenuity and ability displayed by unions in their effort to drive from the market the open-shop employer, open-shop products, and the non-union man, together with the irresistible power of their extensive combinations for that purpose. Most of their unlawful acts are designed to forward the closed shop. "Show me an injunction granted," says the president of the Carpenters' Union, "and I will show you one more link forged in the chain of open-shop dogma."

Mr. Gompers, speaking upon the subject for the federated unions which he represents, assumes his customary uncompromising tone and says:

"As the immortal Lincoln said: 'This country cannot long remain half free and half slave.' So say we that any establishment cannot long remain or be successfully operated part union and part non-union."

John Mitchell, another officer of the American Federation of Labor, in his optimistic view of organized labor apparently expects that all the country will eventually pay homage to the closed shop and that the rights of the independent worker will to that extent be abandoned. He is author of the statement that "with the rapid extension of trade unions the tendency is toward the growth of compulsory membership in them and the time will doubtless come when this compulsion will be

as general and will be considered as little of a grievance as the compulsory attendance of children at school."

The criticism of the closed shop lies not so much against this regime in the isolated cases where it might be mutually and voluntarily sought and desired, but to the penalties and difficulties with which employers and employees are confronted for refusing to conform. For this reason one cannot form an intelligent judgment on the issue until familiar with the methods employed to secure its adoption.

The strike is usually the first weapon employed to unionize or close a shop. Court decisions which condemn such a combination state that if this attitude is aimed at some unskilled or truly undesirable associate the combination is justified and legal, but the mere fact that a man is non-union affords no excuse for a movement of such coercive power to deprive him of employment. By methods similar to this non-union workmen have been followed from one position to another and their discharge successively dictated by the same threat addressed to their successive employers.

In cases where strikes fail of their purpose the American Federation of Labor, with a constitution providing for boycotting, has elaborate and powerful boycotting machinery available to each affiliated union in its efforts to enforce the closed shop. The Federation has a total membership of nearly 2,000,000 members, controlling a purchasing power of 10,000,000—about a tenth of our entire population. This membership is enjoined to observe all boycotts under penalty of fines or expulsion, and is divided and subdivided into national trade unions, some 30,000 local unions, over 500 city federations, and some 30 state federations. The 500 city federations are local federations of all the unions in a particular city, while the state federations hold the same relation to all the unions in a particular state. Thus the organizers of the American Federation of Labor, of which there are about 1,400, and the organizers of the different trade unions can at any time command the entire organized force of all labor unions in a city, or all labor unions in a state, in their efforts to prevent a local dealer handling merchandise produced by an open-shop employer. With agents in every trade center of the country and local federations of all trades to act at their commands with traveling agents going from city to city, and spies to detect open-shop shipments and telegraph the information to the union at the place of consignment, we have a phenomenon hitherto unknown in either democratic or despotic states, with its branches like veins throughout our entire society. When we reflect on the utter impossibility of escaping from the observation and tyranny of this movement in any remote section of the country where it may choose to pursue, and remember that it is largely designed and manipulated to eliminate the non-union worker from industry, our feelings change to alarm. All

other attempts at secret orders and societies or the conduct of organized feuds pale into insignificance before the ramifications, power, and aspirations of this institution. The idea staggers the imagination, for it discloses the irresistible machinery of an army of well-disciplined men against which the non-conformist is helpless.

Unfortunately, the use of the union label is another example of the same tyranny and intolerence, for had it not been for this general persecution by organized labor and its desire to exclude the unorganized workers the union label would never have been brought into operation. It is another way of discriminating against the employer who harbors the non-conformist. In practically no instance does it appear that the union label stands primarily for such legitimate purposes as skill, hours, wages, sanitary conditions, and other conditions of employment which it is right and just that the workers should fight for. The only universal test of the right to use the union label is the agreement to discriminate against the non-union worker.

The American Federation of Labor publishes what is called a union label gallery, which gives in pictorial form the labels of about one hundred trades, all of which have the indorsement of the American Federation of Labor and the powerful machinery of all its branches to support them. In this way these labels become passports to the market which assure wholesaler and retailer that they may safely purchase the goods, while their absence stamps the merchandise as the handiwork of non-union toil and, therefore, to be shunned and boycotted, or purchased at one's peril.

Another effective way of discriminating against the non-union worker is shown by the methods employed by the United Brotherhood of Carpenters, which is probably the most powerful trade organization in the United States. It has adopted a regulation whereby each of its 200,000 members is forbidden under penalty of ten dollars to handle or work upon any materials which come from an open shop. The manufacturers' customers, or those who might be customers, are told that if they purchase the products of these open shops strikes will be called upon the buildings which they are constructing. If the customer desiring to utilize open-shop materials should employ non-union men to perform the work of installing them, which the union men refuse to perform, he is confronted by another rule that no union carpenters will work for him or any other contractor on any building where non-union men are emplyed.

So effective has this combination become on the island of Manhattan that practically no wood trim which is produced or worked upon by any non-union woodworker can enter into the construction of buildings on that island. Most of the large builders in order to avoid the constant repetition of strikes against open-shop woodwork, have entered into a

formal written agreement for a period of years not to purchase it, although it can be secured at prices twenty-five to fifty per cent cheaper than the union material.

Recently a more formidable combination than these two just cited has been formed to further this same attack upon the rights of any worker who does not subscribe to the union principles. Some ten national organizations, including the machinists, sheet metal workers, and molders, have formed a separate department of the American Federation of Labor in order that, among other things, they may assist each other in carrying out work of this kind. This department has issued notices from its headquarters, Washington, D. C., to the various unions belonging to it directing them not to handle or work upon the machinery or other metal work of particular concerns which have refused to unionize mills and reject the non-union man. As a result of this manifesto strikes have been called in different parts of the country against this class of non-union products.

All of the numerous trades connected with the construction of buildings and affiliated with the American Federation of Labor have likewise formed a special department connected with the Federation, which is known as the Building Trades Department. Through its headquarters at Washington it is able to direct strikes and boycotts against the building products of any concern which is not being conducted in accordance with the demands of any of the affiliated unions, and the usual method is to call out all trades on any building where open-shop materials are being used. This department has passed a resolution to aid the Metal Trades Department by refusing to handle any metal products or materials which are not made in closed shops, and the cooperation of these two departments in the work of excluding and discriminating against the non-union worker and non-union products presents a formidable scheme which is most alarming to this persecuted class.

If, according to closed-shop advocates, methods such as we have been examining are to make union membership a necessary qualification for employment, it becomes material to consider under what conditions a man can become or remain a member. No man has an enforceable legal right to membership in any trade union, any more than he has in any private order or society. If he applies for membership, or his name is presented by some friendly member, he may be rejected, or "black-balled," as the expression goes, in the same way that he might be so treated by any private society. In some instances non-union men who have displeased the organization have been admitted on condition that they would pay large fines as a penalty for past "scabbing." Some men who have once been members and withdrawn have been obliged to pay dues on the wages they earned for the years that intervened.

Unions have also seen fit to close the doors to all applicants for a given period of time, because it was thought that the membership was growing too large. Other restrictions relate to the years and conditions when a man may join, and state that he must serve an apprenticeship of three years, and must begin between the ages of 18 and 21. All older men are thus excluded, except in certain emergencies where the rules are suspended, and as the number of apprentices is usually limited by the union, even the younger men are often barred except upon the payment of "graft" money to the officers in charge. Some unions discriminate systematically against foreigners. The Carpenters' Union, with 1,900 branches or local unions throughout the United States, will not admit a person to membership except on the majority vote of the members of the local union to which the application is made, and if he is rejected by that branch he cannot thereafter be admitted by any one of the 1,900 locals except by consent of the union to which he made first application and a two-third vote of the union to which he made second application. Thus the action of a local union in California, actuated as it might be by a group of members owing the applicant some personal grudge, may keep a man from employment in New York or any other State under the closed-shop regime. Such are some of the difficulties which must often be overcome by him who would join or remain a member of the union.

If membership in the union is made synonymous with an opportunity to pursue a trade as it would be in the closed-shop regime, there would be no redress from unjust union action which kept a man from his trade by keeping him out of the union. While a private organization may properly control the selection of its own membership, one of the principal functions of government is to protect liberty and the right to pursue a trade. This truism discloses the fundamental error of the closed-shop idea. If there is one condition incompatible with the principles of democracy and liberty it is a state where the rights and opportunities of pursuing a trade are controlled and monopolized by an irresponsible body of private citizens. Such a condition, maintained though it may be by a combination of working-people, is fraught with the same objections and evils as the despotism of any monorachy or oligarchy.

If a commercial nation in peaceful times cannot protect the rights of its working class to secure employment from those who wish to employ them it has lamentably failed. If the chance to seek and earn a living is to be vouchsafed by the grace and favor of a private organization, instead of being guaranteed by the government as in the past, surely that institution will rule in this country, and no other.

Another indictment of the closed shop is that it seeks and maintains monopolistic prices and, if successful, would be more oppressive to our people in this way than any other monopoly. Today the carpenter in

New York receives five dollars a day, which is more than is paid in most trades; and we are paying twenty-five to fifty per cent more for the wood materials they erect in order to avoid purchases from open shops. The craft which does not share this monopoly must pay correspondingly more for the rent of buildings which the carpenter erects without corresponding increase in its wages. The non-producer is a similar sufferer. The consummation of the closed-shop scheme would do more than all combinations of capital to raise prices and the cost of living, as the wages fixed by the union regime, with complete control over its craft, would furnish a basis for the cost of production above which all employers, however sharply competing, would be obliged to figure some margin of profit.

The general public would also be injured in another way. If labor unions, by the consummation of their closed-shop aims, can command obedience from all workers, the entire body of workers engaged in industry and transportation can and will be marched out in combined opposition on any issue affecting some one man. Such wide-spread disturbances inflict great damage on disinterested parties and threaten the stability of government itself. But recently all transportation in Ireland was interrupted because a few porters were discharged for refusing to handle the materials of a boycotted firm. The sympathetic strikes of all industries in Philadelphia at the time of the traction strike threatened to become state-wide, and would have become so under closed-shop conditions. The Debs strikes of 1893 paralyzed the service of all railroads entering Chicago because they hauled cars of the boycotted Pullman Company. These sympathetic combinations disrupting satisfactory relations of neutral employers and employees, and inflicting loss and rioting on the public, are among the worst features of trade-unionism today, and the main restraint on them is the fear on the part of labor leaders that they cannot make them succeed. Under the closed-shop rule the conduct of men could be dictated without fear of recalcitrancy and the whole country thrown into turmoil over some local complaint.

If the courts should uphold these combinations to enforce the closed shop, the employers could in the cause of self-defense pursue a similar war of discrimination against all union men until, by their combined power and wealth, they were able to bring about the complete disintegration of all trade-unions. Such a war is to be avoided by judicial protection. The trade union should be permitted to exist and should be protected against any combination of employers to destroy it by making it difficult for its members to obtain employment. Likewise the non-union man and those who choose to employ him have a right to exist, and a combination to drive him into the organization or out of the trade should be suppressed. Nothing could be fairer than to place upon

the statute books in all the states a law which forbids any combination on the part of any class of people, whether employers or employees, to discriminate against a man on the ground that he is or is not a member of a labor union.

FREE SHOPS FOR FREE MEN

(By W. H. Pfahler, in the *American Economic Association*, Volume 4, pages 182-189, 1903.)

The recent rapid increase of membership in labor unions has brought to the front the demand for a "union shop," which is being forced upon the employer whenever and wherever he is too weak to resist it. The manufacturer or employer of labor who resists this demand is said to have an "open shop"; and it is well to consider this feature of the struggle between employer and employee, with regard to the conditions created, but without sentiment or sympathy for either side. An "open shop" is a term quite common among employers, but it would have no significance were it not for this demand of the labor union to close the shop to all but union men and to prevent the employer from hiring free men who prefer to control the sale of their own labor according to its value, rather than at a price fixed by a body of men whose purpose is to create a standard of wages based upon the ability of the incompetent workman, or more frequently upon the emergency existing at the time such wages are fixed. The union claims that the efficient or skilled workman will always receive more than the standard wage; and while this may be true so long as there is one more workman in any craft than is required, when the condition changes so that there is a surplus of men, the incompetent is discharged, the wage of the skilled man is reduced to the standard which was fixed on a false basis, and often even lower than that, while the place of the incompetent workman is supplanted by machinery.

It is for this economic reason that a very large number of the best mechanics refuse to join the union, preferring to remain free men until forced by "persuasion," which is the only means allowed by the laws of the union, but which may be physical if moral will not answer the purpose. The last resort of the union in this direction is to demand a union shop, so that the employer, by refusing employment to a free man, or by discharging such a man if he continue to refuse to join the union, shall assist them in their persuasive purposes.

It is this action on the part of the union that compels the employer who prefers, in the purchase of labor, to make no distinction as to his employees other than such as follow natural laws to contend for an "open shop," often at great cost and severe loss to himself, and to maintain that condition, regardless of the union demand. That he is

right in doing so cannot be questioned; it is the true American condition that every man shall be free to seek employment wherever and under whatsoever conditions he may prefer, without regard to his politics, his religion, or his affiliation with organizations based on principles which he cannot endure.

The opposition to the labor union today is not the objection to organized labor, but the objection to the methods employed by unions to force conditions and create ideals conceived frequently without due knowledge of existing facts, and especially objection to the secrecy in which all their plans are made and executed. The opposition of the employer to labor unions does not arise from any desire to prevent the accomplishment of their efforts towards the improvement of the condition of the workingman; the intelligent employer knows full well that the highest efficiency can be attained only by such improved conditions. He does object, however, to the attempt of the union to sustain in secret, by approval and applause, unlawful acts on the part of its individual members, even though these acts are in public denounced and claimed to be contrary to the laws of the union.

I have yet to find a rule of any union which provides for the punishment or expulsion of a member because of any criminal act that he may commit, even though convicted before a jury, if such act has been exercised against an employer who has refused to grant the demands formulated by the union in secret conclave. On the other hand I do know of cases where the union, out of funds contributed by the membership, has paid fines of large amounts inflicted upon its members by courts before whom they have been convicted for crime committed against the employer or against some free man who refused to remain idle at their dictation.

Another mistake of labor unions is that they endeavor to think and work along one line only—that is, to define and demand the rights, as they conceive them, of the workingman, but never attempt to define his duties; to define and demand the pay of the workingman, but never to define the equivalent in labor he shall furnish for such pay. This is the fact to such a great extent that the employer can very easily see in the action of the union the embodiment of the sentiment and the so-called principle which cause it to say, or at least to imply by its actions, that the employer has no right which the union is bound to respect.

I have outlined these conditions of the labor unions as they exist and are presented to the employer that I may more clearly give you his reason for opposing the union shop and refusing to become a party to the attempt to create such conditions, while at the same time he may be in favor of organized labor and not only ready but anxious to confer at all times with its representatives upon any subject which is within

its jurisdiction and the consideration of which will result in mutual benefit to employer and employee.

The difference between a union shop and an open shop can be clearly defined as a difference in management. In the union shop the union, without invitation, with no endorsement as to its qualifications, for no ostensible reason except to exercise accidental power, attempts to limit the owner or employer in the exercise of his rights and judgment as to the proper use of that which is his and to put the workingman under the dictation of a walking delegate or shop committee. The open shop, on the contrary, is free to all, to the union man as well as the non-union man, and places no restrictions on the employee which he is bound to accept.

In no case with which I am familiar has the demand for a union shop been accompanied by a proposition for benefit to the employer, except perhaps that he may, by conceding to the demand, hope to avoid the persecution of the local union to which his men belong. On the other hand the change from an open shop to a union shop gives the union entire control. And if the members in secret conclave decide, because of a hot-headed leader to enforce a rule in the shop which is unwise, unfair and detrimental to the interests of the employer, the ultimatum is a strike, the closing of the shop, and loss in time, money, and often property. Is there any wonder that the employer elects to have the strike which preserves his liberty, rather than that which must be made to restore his liberty?

The demand for the union shop presents to the employer the following dangers which are incorporated in the written or unwritten laws of almost every labor union: (1) The surrender of the privilege of selecting his employees to a committee who recognize no standard of efficiency but membership in the union. "No card, no work," is the rule. (2) The necessity of discharging old and faithful employees who claim to be free men and who refuse to join the union. (3) The discharge of the foreman or the superintendent, who, in the performance of his duties, may have offended the walking delegate or shop committee. (4) The limitation of apprentices to a ratio established by the union in many cases fifty years or more ago and retained in force regardless of any change in conditions or requirements. (5) The opposition to the introduction of labor-saving machines, designed in most cases to relieve the skilled man from the strain of labor and to increase his efficiency with reduced energies, as well as to increase production in ratio to the wants of an increased population and to reduce the cost to the consumer. (6) The limitation of the earning capacity of the industrious and ambitious workingman to the standard of the lazy and incompetent. (7) The obstruction to every plan of premiums or promotion which may encourage a workingman to increase his skill and

better his condition. (8) The limitation of output by every means in the power of the union, on the principle that if every man will do less there will be more for every other man to do.

VIEWS OF J. LAWRENCE LAUGHLIN

The fact is today unmistakable that the unions include only a small fraction of the total body of laborers. In spite of the proclaimed intention to include in a union each worker of every occupation, and then to federate all the unions, the unions contain far less than a majority of the working force of the country. To the present time, therefore, the practical policy of the unions has resulted in one of artificial monopoly; that is, not able to control the whole supply, the union attempts to fix a "union scale" and maintain only its own members at work. This situation, consequently, means always and inevitably the existence of non-union men, against whom warfare must be waged. Under this system high wages for some can be obtained only by the sacrifice of others outside the union. The economic means chosen by the unions, then, to gain higher wages are practicable only for a part of the labor body, and then only provided all other competitors can be driven from the field. The policy of artificial monopoly being, thus, the common principle of a great majority of unions, we may next briefly consider the inevitable consequences of such a policy.

1. The immediate corollary of the union policy is a warfare against the non-union men. This hostility against brother workers is excused on the ground that it is the only means of keeping up the "union scale" of wages. Although an artificial monopoly is unjust and selfish, and certain to end in failure, the unions have doggedly adhered to it so far as to create a code of ethics which justifies any act which will preserve the monopoly. This is the reason why a non-union man seeking work is regarded as a traitor to his class, when in reality he is a traitor to an insufficient economic principle. As a human being he has the same right to live and work as any other, whether a member of a union or not. The arrogance of unionism in ruling on the fundamentals of human liberty, the assumption of infallibility and superiority to institutions which have been won only by centuries of political sacrifice and effort, is something supernal—something to be resented by every lover of liberty. Unionism, if unjust to other men, cannot stand.

2. Since the "union scale" of an artificial monopoly is clearly not the market rate of wages, the maintenance of the former can be perpetuated only by limiting the supply to the members of the union. The only means of keeping non-union men from competition is force. Consequently the inevitable outcome of the present policy of many labor or-

ganizations is lawlessness and an array of power against the state. Their policy being what it is, their purposes can be successfully carried out only by force, and by denying to outsiders the privileges of equality and liberty. Sometimes the means of enforcing their unenacted views is known as "peaceful picketing"; but this is only a mask for threats of violence. In fact, intimidation of all kinds up to actual murder has been employed to drive non-union competitors out of the labor market. Picketing, boycotts, breaking heads, slugging, murder—all outrages against law and order, against a government of liberty and equality—are the necessary consequences of the existing beliefs of unionists, and they cannot gain their ends without them. So long as the unions adhere to their present principles so long will they be driven to defy the majesty of the law, and work to subvert a proper respect for the orderly conduct of government.

The dictum of a few men in a union has been set above the equality of men before the law. The union lays down an ethical proposition, and by its own agencies sets itself to apply it at any and all cost. This is a method of tyranny and not of liberty. The right of the humblest person to be protected in his life and property is the very connerstone of free government. It means more for the weak than for the strong. Therefore, the opinions of a loosely constituted body, representing a limited set of interests, should not—and will not—be allowed to assume a power greater than the political liberty for all, rich or poor, which has been a thousand years in the making. By the abuses of unionism there has been set up an imperium in imperio—one inconsistent with the other. One or the other must give way. Which one it shall be no one can doubt. The dictum of rioters will never be allowed by modern society to eradicate the beneficent results which have issued from the long evolution of civil liberty. If the platform of the unions is opposed to the fundamentals of law and progress, it must yield to the inevitable and be reconstructed on correct principles of economics and justice.

3. The labor leaders, finding themselves opposed by the strong forces of society, have at times made use of politics. They have sought to influence executive action in their favor. Mayors of cities are under pressure not to use the police to maintain order when strikers are intimidating non-union men. More than that, since the presence of soldiers would secure safety from force to non-union workers, union leaders have urged governors, and even the President of the United States, to refrain from sending troops to points where disorderly strikes are in operation. Not only the police and the soldiery, but even the courts, when used solely to enforce the law as created by the majority of voters, have been conspicuously attacked as the enemies of "organized labor." The hostility of these agencies in truth is not

toward labor, or its organization, but toward the perverse and misguided policy adopted by the labor leaders.

The entry of unions into politics, in general, is a sign of sound growth. It is, at least, a recognition that the only legitimate way of enforcing their opinions upon others is by getting them incorporated into law by constitutional means. And yet legislation in favor of special interests will be met by the demand of equal treatment for all other interests concerned; and in this arena the battle must be fought out. The unions will not have their own way by any means. So far as concerns the rate of wages, in any event, political agitation and legislation can do little. The forces governing the demand and supply of labor are beyond the control of legislation. But other subjects of labor legislation have been introduced, as is well known, such as eight-hour laws, high wages for state employees, and demands for employment by the government of only union men. All these efforts would be largely unnecessary were the action of the unions founded on another principle than monopoly.

4. The difficulties arising from this incorrect policy of artificial monopoly of the labor supply have been felt by the unions, but they have not been assigned to their true cause. Believing in this theory, even though incorrect, they have gone on enforcing their demands by methods unrelated to the real causes at work. They have tried to strengthen their position by claiming a share in the ownership of the establishment in which they work, or a right of property in the product they produce, or a part in the business management of the concern which employs them. They have tried to say who shall be hired, who dismissed, where materials shall be bought, by whom goods shall be carried or sold, and the like. Their purpose is not always clear; but it seems to be a part of a plan to keep the employer at their mercy, and thus under the necessity of submitting to any and all demands as regards wages.

In this matter the unions cannot succeed. The very essence of a defined rate of wages is that the laborer contracts himself out of all risk. If the workman claims to be a partner in the commercial enterprise, asking in addition a part of the gains, he must also be willing to share the losses. This is obviously impossible for the ordinary working man. Hired labor and narrow means go together. Capital can, labor cannot, wait without serious loss. Laborers, therefore, cannot take the risks of industry and assume the familiar losses of business. This is the full and conclusive reason why the laborer contracts himself out of risk and accepts a definite rate of wages. If he does this, he is estopped, both morally and legally, from further proprietary claims on the product or on the establishment.

By way of resume, it is to be seen that the attempts to increase the income of labor on the unionist principle of a limitation of competitors has led into an impasse, where further progress is blocked by the following evils:

1. The wrong to non-union men.
2. The defiance of the established order of society.
3. A futile resort to legislation.
4. The interference with the employer's management.

THE OPEN SHOP

(*Bliss Encyclopedia of Social Reform.*)

The arguments in favor of the open shop are based upon the necessity of preserving the freedom of individual contracts.

Right of Individual Contract. In a recent decision of the Superior Court of Cook County, Illinois, it was held that agreements for the closed shop "would, if executed, tend to create a monopoly in favor of the members of the different unions, to the exclusion of workmen not members of such unions, and are, in this respect, unlawful."

The law of morality and the law of man forbid any citizen, whether he be laborer or capitalist, to enforce his demands by the oppression of others, by a denial to any man of his right to work, for whom he will, and for what he will, of his right to hire any man for what that man is willing to accept.

The freedom of action is legally and, it is probable, economically a matter of as much concern to society as the freedom of the unionist to combine for proper purposes.

Unless we are prepared to relegate all the laborers in a trade to a condition or status determined by a combination or association known as a trade-union, and to deny the advisibility of permitting a worker to choose freely between an individual or a collective contract, we must insist that the compulsory unionization of industry is economically indefensible.

The conditions under which a man shall dispose of his labor are of such exceeding importance to society that, if freedom is to be denied, the restrictions imposed should be determined by the government and not by any other agency. Such regulations should be just, uniform, and certain; they should not be subject to the possible caprice, selfishness, or special exigencies of a labor organization. When it is necessary to restrict the freedom of labor or capital to enter any industry, the matter becomes the subject of public concern and public regulation. If membership in a labor organization is to be a condition precedent to

the right of securing employment, it will be necessary for the government to control the constitution, policy, and management of such associations so far as may be requisite for the purpose in view.

Trade unions have no right to usurp the sovereignty of the State and to destroy that individual freedom which is the cardinal principle of American life, whether it be religious, political, or industrial.

If unions are to render permanent service to the laborers, they must be voluntary organizations. If any device can be invented by employers of laborers by which laborers can be coerced into joining or kept from joining labor unions, then these organizations no longer represent either the best thought or the best interests of the laborers. They must necessarily soon degenerate into mere dictatorial groups. There is no principle of ethics, economics, or equity that will make the coercion of laborers any better than the coercion of laborers by capitalists.

Men who, as victims of trade union despotism, are forced into the union would prove elements of weakness and prepare the way for disintegration.

Danger of Trade Union Power. An important argument against acceding to the demands of trade unionists for the closed shop is the danger involved in granting too much power to the labor organizations.

It is contended that it would be highly dangerous to allow a permanent and all-inclusive organization of laborers to control such matters as admission to a trade, the introduction of improved machinery, and the rate of wages; that it is highly desirable that a trade union should always be kept upon its good behavior by the knowledge that an unreasonable or selfish policy will drive both employers and the public to seek relief by appealing to the non-union man.

Injury to Business. It is claimed that the open shop is necessary in order to preserve the liberty and protect the rights of employers. The closed shop means that none but union men shall be employed; that the foreman shall be acceptable to the union and, therefore, presumably a member of it; that the rules of the work shop shall be made by the unions; and it is claimed that all this practically takes the management of the business out of the hands of the employers and places it with those who lack business responsibility. The men who have put their capital into the business can no longer control their own property, but are practically compelled to turn it over to the management of an organization which deems its own interests in conflict with those of the capitalists.

The closed shop, would, it is claimed, be injurious to business and thus disastrous to the general welfare of society.

By imposing on a shop where there is no dissatisfaction, the liability of a sympathetic strike or of a strike growing out of a quarrel with some other union.

By taking the management out of the hands of the employers who have the greatest stake in the business and thus inviting failure.

By destroying all competition between good and poor workmen, and thus lowering the standard of skill and resulting in an inferior product.

By destroying all competition between union and non-union men and enabling the unions to force wages up to a point which the business could not stand; and with a higher price for a poorer product, a closed shop could not compete with establishments not so handicapped.

OPEN OR CLOSED SHOP

(By Walter Drew, in *American Industries*, Volume 11, page 23, August, 1919.)

Ethical and social considerations are all opposed to the closed shop. The closed shop union, instead of being representative of labor as a whole, is hostile to the non-member, for he is a constant menace to its monopoly. When the monopoly through the closed shop gets firmly enough entrenched in an industry, this hostility to the outsider becomes more clearly defined and expressed. Membership fees are raised to a prohibitive point, being as much as $500 in a number of cases, and at least one union has at different times closed its books entirely to new members. Likewise, the number of apprentices allowed to learn the trade grows less as the union grows stronger. The closed shop, then, means a closed door, not only to the skilled mechanic, who is not a member, but to the American youth as well. It is a denial of the "equal opportunity for all," of which we are wont to boast in this country.

The wage scale, reducing all workmen to a dead level, the securing of work through merit, the lack of incentive and the consciousness of taking high wages for a restricted and decreased output—all tend to deterioration of the character of the workman. The pride in doing the best that is in him, the desire to return full measure for value received, are gone. The employer is a robber and oppressor—get as much as possible from him, and give back as little as possible. This is the creed the closed shop workman is taught. Uneconomic? Yes—but, worst of all, is the effect upon the workman as a man as a citizen.

The last reason is a preachment. Since man left the cave and built for himself dwellings, the art of buildings has reflected more than any other single art or industry the enlarging of man's ideals and the progress of the race. Thus it comes that buildings are monuments to the aims and purposes and ideals of the men who conceive them and build them. It is well that the plans include utility and beauty and that the materials be well selected, but the building will not be a worthy monument if, in the raising of its walls, equal opportunity has

been denied and a vicious and hateful institution in our industrial system has been made stronger.

And in conclusion, if any reader wishes further information, proof, or data, as to any one of the reasons offered, a communication to Walter Drew, 34 W. 33rd St., New York City, will receive prompt reply. Every statement of fact, especially the ones to the effect that the wage cost in closed shop trades is much in excess of what it should be, and that the closed shop building contract invites trouble rather than protects from it, can be fully substantiated by abundant evidence.

And a last word: It is your interests that are sought to be protected in this movement. The members of the associations represented in or coöperating with the Open Shop Bureau are business men, owners and manufacturers like yourself. Their interests, like yours, are bound up in the progress of industry and in the industrial health and growth of their respective communities. They ask you to work for and not against a common cause.

PROBLEMS OF ORGANIZED LABOR

(By J. E. GEORGE, in *American Economic Association*, Volume 4, pages 196-200, 1903.)

Collective bargaining requires for its successful operation an effective organization of employers on the one hand and of employees on the other. The question before us in the present discussion is: Are employees justified, however, in their endeavor to control by their unions the labor engaged in the various industries? Mr. White's thesis is that while the coercing of non-union men into becoming union men may seem arbitrary from the employer's point of view and from the non-union man's point of view may seem an abridgment of personal liberty, such a course can be justified on the ground that unanimity of action and a spirit of solidarity must be secured among the workmen if they are to advance their interests. Moreover, since the best interests of all are promoted through organization, it is held by union men that to permit union and non-union men to be engaged in the same shop works against the best interest and highest efficiency of the union. Such means must be used, therefore, as may be proper to bring about the conversion of non-union men. Such, I believe, is the view held not only by Mr. White but by trade unionists in general at the present time. Moreover the organization of employers and the consolidation of capital make it necessary that trade unionists employ the same methods for their own protection by supporting one another and arranging a collective bargain with their employers. In indorsing the general proposition that in our present industrial regime it is necessary for workmen to develop strong organizations in order to be able

to make an equitable contract for the sale of their labor, I do not want to be understood as endorsing means that are sometimes used to attain those ends. The line of demarkation between the proper means and those which should be condemned has, in general, been well made by the courts, and need not be described here.

Trade unions are coming more and more to be recognized by employers as permanent part of the industrial order. In many trades in Great Britain the employers prefer to make terms with the trade unions which shall apply to non-union workmen as well, rather than to make terms with each of the classes separately. It is coming to be recognized as good policy to deal with some form of organization, and more and more to make that organization responsible, so far as may be, for meeting the obligations that have been assumed by it for the workers in the trade it represents. Although there will always be more or less friction between trade unionists and non-unionists, a friction which will be increased in our country through the immigration of workmen of lower standards of living, the problem will tend to become less difficult as employers treat more and more with the labor organizations as the agent for the labor it would control. With the increase in power which trade unions thus attain they must more and more be held responsible for their part in the joint agreements with the employers, and sooner or later they will probably be required to become incorporated bodies, so that they may be held legally responsible for their acts.

GRIEVANCES OF UNIONS

(From report of U. S. Industrial Commission.)

If union and non-union men work side by side, the non-union men either do or do not receive the full union wages. In either case the union feels that it has a grievance against them. If non-union rollers are permitted to work in a steel mill for which a scale has been signed by the Amalgamated Association, their rate of pay is fixed by the action of the organization. They receive, the unionists hold, many more dollars every month than they would receive if the members of the union did not spend time and trouble and money in maintaining the organization and formulating and enforcing its demands. They make a gain, therefore, strictly at the expense of their organized companies. Simply as a matter of share and share alike, the union men feel that the non-union men ought to join the organization, and that if they have not enough sense of fairness to do it of themselves they ought to be compelled to do it.

On the other hand, argues the unionist, if non-union bricklayers are permitted to be introduced at the will of the employers, side by side with the members of the union, there can be no possible guaranty that they do receive the union rate. The union has no jurisdiction over them and no means of knowing what they get. There is a constant probability, therefore, that the employer will introduce as many non-union men as possible, will hire them below the union rate, and will, as opportunity offers, discharge the members of the organization. Those who are in the union will be tempted to get out of it and work for lower wages in order to retain their employment. The presence of the non-union men is a menace to the existence of the organization and to the wages and other working conditions of the craft. The same menace exists even in those exceptional occupations, like the steel industry, in which, because of their very magnitude, uniformity of conditions can more easily be obtained. Even there, as the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers has recently complained, there is a tendency to give work to non-union mills at the expense of union mills when the same company owns both; and if non-union men are permitted to enter union mills at all, the union can have no guaranty that the number of them will not be gradually increased until they can be made a means of destroying the union altogether.

The union is conceived as a means of bettering the condition of its members by united action. If this action is to be thoroughly effective, it must be taken by or on behalf of all the members of the craft. It is by the establishment of an absolute monopoly of labor power of a particular kind that the union hopes to raise the market price of that sort of labor power and to ameliorate the conditions under which it is sold and used. The trade-unionist conceives the members of his craft as a corporate body whose interests it is the duty of every member to further. More than that, he conceives the whole wage-earning class as a large unity, to the welfare of which every member of it is in duty bound to contribute. The working man who refuses to contribute to the support of the union of his craft, who stands aloof and gives aid and comfort to the enemy, is regarded as a traitor to his own trade and to the working class as a whole. His mind is to be enlightened, if it can be, by argument and persuasion; but if he refuses to be persuaded, any legal means of bringing him to conform his action to right rules are legitimate and praiseworthy.

Bibliography

A list of publications containing valuable material on the query under discussion is given below. The books and magazines can be secured from their publishers. Included in the bibliography are the names of a number of organizations and bureaus which will be glad to furnish material as far as they are able.

GENERAL REFERENCES

The Bureau of Extension of the University of North Carolina will furnish material in addition to this bulletin, such as it may be able to obtain from time to time. Address the Bureau of Extension, Chapel Hill, N. C.

The North Carolina Library Commission will furnish traveling package libraries on the question upon the request of the principal of the school. Address Miss Mary B. Palmer, Secretary, Raleigh, N. C.

Debaters' Handbook Series—"Open versus Closed Shop." 1911. This contains 200 pages of arguments and references on both sides of the query. Published by the H. W. Wilson Co., 958-64 University Ave., New York, N. Y. Price, $1.25.

The Bureau of Public Information, American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C., will furnish material on the affirmative.

The National Association of Manufacturers of the United States of America, 30 Church St., New York City, publishes and distributes free of charge a large number of pamphlets opposing the closed shop and unionism in general.

United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D. C., may be able to furnish a limited number of reports and pamphlets bearing on the subject.

The North Carolina senators and representatives in Congress will furnish from Congressional sources whatever material as is at their disposal, upon request.

T. S. Adams and H. L. Sumner—"Labor Problems." The MacMillan Co., New York City. 1905.

Mary Beard—"A Short History of the American Labor Movement." Harcourt, Brace and Howe. New York City. 1920.

E. L. Bogart—"Economic History of the United States." Longmans, Green and Co., New York City. 1907.

John R. Commons and Associates—"American Labor History." The MacMillan Co., New York City. 1919.

H. DeB. Gibbins—"Industrial History of England." Scribners, New York City.

Arthur Gleason—"What the Workers Want." Harcourt, Brace, and Howe, New York City. 1920.

George G. Groat—"An Introduction to the Study of Organized Labor in America." The MacMillan Co., New York City. 1916.

Sidney and Beatrice Webb—"Industrial Democracy." Longmans, Green and Co., New York City.

American Economic Review, Volume 8, page 752, December, 1918. "Closed Shop versus Open Shop." H. E. Hoagland.

Annals of the American Academy, Volume 69, pages 118-127, January, 1917. "Extent of Trade Unionism." Leo Wolman.

New Republic, Volume 22, page 179, April 7, 1920. "The President's Industrial Conference." Felix Frankfurter.

AFFIRMATIVE

Annals of the American Academy, Volume 36, page 391, September, 1910. "Sympathetic Strike." C. D. Pratt.

Annals of the American Academy, Volume 44, pages 141-144, November, 1912. "Industrial Peace." John Golden.

Atlantic Monthly, Volume 125, page 225, February, 1920. "Labor Policy of the American Trusts." Carlton H. Parker.

Atlantic Monthly, Volume 113, pages 161-170, February, 1914. "The Economic Necessity of Trade Unionism." John Mitchell.

Engineering Magazine, Volume 45, page 566, January, 1914. "Short-Sighted Methods in Dealing With Labor." C. J. Morrison.

Journal of Political Economy, Volume 15, page 345, June, 1907. "Trade Union Point of View." R. F. Hoxie.

New Republic, Volume 8, pages 178-180, September 23, 1916. "Unionism versus Anti-Unionism."

Outlook, Volume 97, pages 497-502, March 4, 1911. "The Reason for the Unions." Washington Glodden.

Political Science Quarterly, Volume 17, page 369, September, 1902. "Do Trade Unions Limit Output?" John Martin.

Survey, Volume 43, page 53, November 8, 1919. "Closed Shop and Other Industrial Issues of the Steel Strike." J. A. Fitch.

Survey, Volume 43, page 58, November 8, 1919. "Closed Towns." S. A. Shaw.

John Graham Brooks—"Labor's Challenge to the Social Order." The MacMillan Co., New York City. 1920.

Helen Marot—"American Labor Unions." Henry Holt and Co., New York City. 1914.

NEGATIVE

American Economic Association, Volume 4, pages 882-189, 1903. "Free Shops for Free Men." W. H. Pfahler.

American Economic Association, Volume 4, pages 196-200, 1903. "Problems of Organized Labor." J. E. George.

American Industries, Volume 11, pages 20-23, August, 1919. "Open or Closed Shop." Walter Drew.

Annals of the American Academy, Volume 85, pages 214-219, September, 1919. "Organization of an Open Shop Under the Midvale Plan." E. Wilson.

Atlantic Monthly, Volume 112, pages 444-453, October, 1913. "Monopoly of Labor." J. Lawrence Laughlin.

Current Literature, Volume 51, page 654, December, 1911. "Questionable Methods of Trade Unionism."

North American Review, Volume 195, pages 66-74, January, 1912. "The Closed Shop." Walter Gordon Merritt.

Outlook, Volume 115, pages 603-604, April 4, 1917. "Dangerous Tendencies of Organized Labor."

Review of Reviews, Volume 60, November, 1919. "Present Industrial Issues." E. H. Gary.

Survey, Volume 35, page 702, March 11, 1916. "Open and Closed Shop in the Structural Iron Industry." Walter Drew.